



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Sitka 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](http://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: Amanda L. Browning: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Amanda L. Browning: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: William T. Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	18
Table 14: William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses .....	19
Table 15: Michael Thomas Schwaiger: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Michael Thomas Schwaiger: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: Bride Seifert: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	22
Table 18: Bride Seifert: Detailed Responses .....	23

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Sitka Superior Court created by the appointment of Justice Jude Pate to the Alaska Supreme Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Amanda L. Browning, William T. Montgomery, Michael Thomas Schwaiger, and Bride Seifert.

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>	<b>Professional Competence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Suitability of Experience</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	89	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	81	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	95	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	101	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2

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

# 2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Sitka 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 findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Sitka Superior Court created by the appointment of Justice Jude Pate to the Alaska Supreme Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Amanda L. Browning, William T. Montgomery, Michael Thomas Schwaiger, and Bride Seifert.

## *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>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>				
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
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>				
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
<b>Cases Handled</b>				
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
<b>Location of Practice</b>				
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
<b>Gender</b>				
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>
<b><i>Professional Competence</i></b>	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
<b><i>Integrity</i></b>	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
<b><i>Fairness</i></b>	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
<b><i>Judicial Temperament</i></b>	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
<b><i>Suitability of Experience</i></b>	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
<b><i>Overall Rating</i></b>	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 11-18 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
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	105	15.6	84.8	12.4	2.9
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	100	14.9	81.0	18.0	1.0
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	117	17.4	81.2	11.1	7.7
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	129	19.2	78.3	16.3	5.4

**Table 4**  
**Summary of Overall Ratings**

	<b>All Respondents</b>				<b>Respondents with Direct Professional Experience</b>			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	105	4.1	4.0	1.0	89	4.1	4.0	1.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	100	4.4	5.0	.09	81	4.5	5.0	0.9
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	117	4.2	5.0	1.1	95	4.2	5.0	1.1
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	126	4.3	5.0	1.0	99	4.2	5.0	1.0

**Table 5**  
**Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	89	1	1.1	12	13.5	6	6.7	30	33.7	40	44.9
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	81	1	1.2	3	3.7	4	4.9	19	23.5	54	66.7
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	95	5	5.3	4	4.2	9	9.5	23	24.2	54	56.8
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	99	2	2.0	6	6.1	13	13.1	23	23.2	55	55.6

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>	
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	14	4.2	9	3.9	4	4.0	-	-	25	4.3	32	4.0	4	3.0	1	5.0	-	-	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	7	4.7	4	4.3	3	4.7	-	-	28	4.9	30	4.0	2	4.5	4	4.5	3	5.0	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	8	4.5	3	4.3	9	3.7	-	-	15	4.3	51	4.3	7	4.1	2	3.0	-	-	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	14	4.7	14	4.2	4	4.5	-	-	26	4.6	35	3.7	-	-	4	4.5	2	5.0	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>	
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	15	3.7	7	4.3	16	4.1	17	3.8	32	4.3	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	7	4.7	16	4.2	10	4.2	11	4.3	32	4.7	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	10	4.4	20	4.8	18	3.7	18	4.3	26	4.0	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	7	4.3	8	3.3	10	4.0	19	3.9	50	4.5	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>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>
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	6	4.5	15	3.3	41	4.2	22	4.2	5	4.2	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	8	4.0	13	4.5	51	4.6	7	4.1	2	4.5	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	10	3.6	31	4.6	32	4.4	18	4.1	4	2.8	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	7	3.6	14	3.5	42	4.4	31	4.6	5	4.2	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>	
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	16	4.6	1	5.0	62	4.0	8	3.8	2	3.5	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	4	4.5	4	4.5	39	4.3	34	4.7	-	-	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	6	4.0	6	4.7	74	4.2	9	4.6	-	-	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	18	4.4	4	3.8	65	4.2	11	4.5	1	5.0	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>	
<b>Amanda L. Browning</b>	43	3.9	45	4.2	-	-	4.1
<b>William T. Montgomery</b>	50	4.5	30	4.6	-	-	4.5
<b>Michael Thomas Schwaiger</b>	46	4.2	47	4.3	-	-	4.2
<b>Bride Seifert</b>	54	4.3	44	4.2	-	-	4.2

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

**Table 11**  
**Amanda L. Browning**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	89	84.8
Professional reputation	13	12.4
Other personal contacts	3	2.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	79	88.8
Substantial amount of experience	29	32.6
Moderate amount of experience	38	42.7
Limited amount of experience	22	24.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	14	13.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	9.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	30	28.6
Government	38	36.2
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8
Retired	3	2.9
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.9
5 years or fewer	18	17.1
6 to 10 years	10	9.5
11 to 15 years	18	17.1
16 to 20 years	19	18.1
More than 20 years	38	36.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	9	8.6
Criminal	17	16.2
Mixed criminal & civil	46	43.8
Civil	28	26.7
Other	5	4.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	21	20.0
Second District	2	1.9
Third District	72	68.6
Fourth District	8	7.6
Outside Alaska	2	1.9
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	1.0
Male	46	43.8
Female	58	55.2
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 12**  
**Amanda L. Browning**  
**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	105	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Experience within last 5 years	79	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	10	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	29	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	22	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9
Professional reputation	13	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3
Government	32	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.0
Public service agency or organization	4	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.8	3.8	3.0
Retired	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	15	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.7
6 to 10 years	7	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3
11 to 15 years	16	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.1
16 to 20 years	17	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8
More than 20 years	32	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	6	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.5
Criminal	15	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	41	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2
Civil	22	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2
Other	5	4.2	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	16	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	62	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0
Fourth District	8	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8
Outside Alaska	2	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	43	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.9
Female	45	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 13**  
**William T. Montgomery**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	81	81.0
Professional reputation	18	18.0
Other personal contacts	1	1.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	78	96.3
Substantial amount of experience	34	42.0
Moderate amount of experience	31	38.3
Limited amount of experience	16	19.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	7.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.0
Private, corporate employee	2	2.0
Judge or judicial officer	33	33.0
Government	38	38.0
Public service agency or organization	5	5.0
Retired	4	4.0
Other	3	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	5	5.0
5 years or fewer	8	8.0
6 to 10 years	19	19.0
11 to 15 years	13	13.0
16 to 20 years	13	13.0
More than 20 years	42	42.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	8.0
Criminal	16	16.0
Mixed criminal & civil	56	56.0
Civil	15	15.0
Other	5	5.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	6	6.0
Second District	4	4.0
Third District	55	55.0
Fourth District	34	34.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	58	58.0
Female	40	40.0
Another identity	1	1.0

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

**Table 14**  
**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	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	78	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7
Substantial amount of experience	34	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	31	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	16	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Professional reputation	18	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.1
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.3	4.7	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.0	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	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	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Government	30	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.0
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Retired	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	5.0	4.9	4.1	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	16	4.3	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.5	4.2
11 to 15 years	10	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
16 to 20 years	11	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	32	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	8	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.0
Criminal	13	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	51	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6
Civil	7	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
Other	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.5
Second District	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.5
Third District	39	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	34	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	50	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Female	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 15**  
**Michael Thomas Schwaiger**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	95	81.2
Professional reputation	13	11.1
Other personal contacts	9	7.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	79	83.2
Substantial amount of experience	47	49.5
Moderate amount of experience	32	33.7
Limited amount of experience	16	16.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	12	10.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	12.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	16	13.7
Government	55	47.0
Public service agency or organization	11	9.4
Retired	4	3.4
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	3	2.6
5 years or fewer	12	10.3
6 to 10 years	20	17.1
11 to 15 years	26	22.2
16 to 20 years	23	19.7
More than 20 years	33	28.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	8.5
Criminal	32	27.4
Mixed criminal & civil	40	34.2
Civil	30	25.6
Other	5	4.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	8	6.8
Second District	6	5.1
Third District	91	77.8
Fourth District	11	9.4
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	1.7
Male	59	50.4
Female	56	47.9
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 16**  
**Michael Thomas Schwaiger**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	117	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	79	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	16	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	47	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	32	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Limited amount of experience	16	4.1	4.1	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	13	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	9	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	8	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Government	51	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Public service agency or organization	7	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
Retired	2	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	10	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4
6 to 10 years	20	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8
11 to 15 years	18	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.7
16 to 20 years	18	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
More than 20 years	26	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	10	4.1	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.9	3.6
Criminal	31	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	32	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Civil	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.1
Other	4	3.3	3.5	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	6	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0
Second District	6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.7
Third District	74	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	9	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.6
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	46	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Female	47	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 17**  
**Bride Seifert**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	101	78.3
Professional reputation	21	16.3
Other personal contacts	7	5.4
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	91	90.1
Substantial amount of experience	36	35.6
Moderate amount of experience	36	35.6
Limited amount of experience	29	28.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	17	13.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	12.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	5.4
Private, corporate employee	1	0.8
Judge or judicial officer	34	26.4
Government	43	33.3
Public service agency or organization	1	0.8
Retired	7	5.4
Other	2	1.6
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	6	4.7
5 years or fewer	9	7.0
6 to 10 years	13	10.1
11 to 15 years	13	10.1
16 to 20 years	21	16.3
More than 20 years	67	51.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	0.8
Prosecution	7	5.4
Criminal	16	12.4
Mixed criminal & civil	52	40.3
Civil	47	36.4
Other	6	4.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.8
First District	31	24.0
Second District	4	3.1
Third District	80	62.0
Fourth District	12	9.3
Outside Alaska	1	0.8
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	1.6
Male	65	50.4
Female	62	48.1
Another identity	-	-

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



**Table 18**  
**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	129	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	91	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	10	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	36	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Limited amount of experience	29	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	21	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.6
Government	35	3.6	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.7
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	8	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3
11 to 15 years	10	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.0
16 to 20 years	19	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.2	4.1	3.9
More than 20 years	51	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	7	3.3	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.6
Criminal	14	3.5	3.9	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	43	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
Civil	31	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
Other	5	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	18	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4
Second District	4	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.8
Third District	66	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	11	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	54	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3
Female	45	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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