



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Fairbanks District Court

Technical Report

Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional
Alliana Salanguit, BA, Research Professional
Rosylind Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional

February 22-26, 2021

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: Maria Pia L. Bahr: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Maria Pia L. Bahr: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Andrew Patrick Baldock: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Andrew Patrick Baldock: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Trisha Haines: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Trisha Haines: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: Steven Hansen: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Steven Hansen: Detailed Responses	23
Table 19: Jennifer Page Hite: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Jennifer Page Hite: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 21: Mike Kenna: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	26
Table 22: Mike Kenna: Detailed Responses	27
Table 23: Scott Oravec: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	28
Table 24: Scott Oravec: Detailed Responses	29
Table 25: Kirk Schwalm: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	30
Table 26: Kirk Schwalm: Detailed Responses.....	31
Table 27: John Foster Wallace: Demographic Description of Respondents	32
Table 28: John Foster Wallace: Detailed Responses.....	33

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Fairbanks District Court created by the retirement of Judge Patrick S. Hammers. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of ten applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Maria Pia L. Bahr, Andrew Patrick Baldock, JB Brainerd, Trisha Haines, Steven Hansen, Jennifer Page Hite, Mike Kenna, Scott Oravec, Kirk Schwalm, and John Foster Wallace. JB Brainerd withdrew his application. Therefore, his 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 on all six characteristics 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>
Maria Pia L. Bahr	98	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	78	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.4
Trisha Haines	73	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Steven Hansen	92	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	131	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.2
Mike Kenna	50	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Scott Oravec	51	3.9	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	70	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9
John Foster Wallace	83	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9

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

2021 Judicial Selection Survey, Fairbanks District Court

Introduction

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

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Fairbanks District Court and Fairbanks Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for Fairbanks District Court, created by the retirement of Judge Patrick S. Hammers. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of ten applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Maria Pia L. Bahr, Andrew Patrick Baldock, JB Brainerd, Trisha Haines, Steven Hansen, Jennifer Page Hite, Mike Kenna, Scott Oravec, Kirk Schwalm, and John Foster Wallace. JB Brainerd withdrew his application. Therefore, his 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 3,522 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,509) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Five individuals received only a paper version of the survey and eight individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 728 online surveys. One survey was 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; ten 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 surveys were returned by any individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 713 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned seven paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper surveys were excluded because they were unsigned. One paper survey was excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that he/she 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, six paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 713 online surveys and six paper surveys, for a total of 719 surveys and a survey return rate of 20.4%. Of the 719 returned surveys, 386 (53.7%) did not rate any of the 19 applicants (ten

Fairbanks District Court applicants and nine Fairbanks Superior Court applicants); 333 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	719	100	333	100	
Type of Practice					
	No response	6	0.8	3	0.9
	Private, solo	143	19.9	40	12.0
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	92	12.8	38	11.4
	Private, 6+ attorneys	70	9.7	30	9.0
	Private, corporate employee	10	1.4	3	0.9
	Judge or judicial officer	69	9.6	42	12.6
	Government	179	24.9	133	39.9
	Public service agency or organization	28	3.9	14	4.2
	Retired	14	1.9	6	1.8
	Other	108	15.0	24	7.2
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	22	3.1	7	2.1
	5 years or fewer	71	9.9	43	12.9
	6 to 10 years	82	11.4	56	16.8
	11 to 15 years	89	12.4	52	15.6
	16 to 20 years	63	8.8	33	9.9
	More than 20 years	392	54.5	142	42.6
Cases Handled					
	No response	7	1.0	3	0.9
	Prosecution	42	5.8	29	8.7
	Criminal	59	8.2	43	12.9
	Mixed criminal & civil	187	26.0	93	27.9
	Civil	377	52.4	143	42.9
	Other	47	6.5	22	6.6
Location of Practice					
	No response	6	0.8	3	0.9
	First District	90	12.5	23	6.9
	Second District	12	1.7	7	2.1
	Third District	463	64.4	184	55.3
	Fourth District	123	17.1	110	33.0
	Outside Alaska	25	3.5	6	1.8
Gender					
	No response	17	2.4	6	1.8
	Male	410	57.0	176	52.9
	Female	292	40.6	151	45.3

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

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

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

Data Management

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper survey 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 11-28 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
Maria Pia L. Bahr	137	19.1	71.5	17.5	10.9
Andrew Patrick Baldock	93	12.9	83.9	12.9	3.2
Trisha Haines	86	12.0	84.9	14.0	1.2
Steven Hansen	119	16.6	77.3	16.0	6.7
Jennifer Page Hite	162	22.5	80.9	16.7	2.5
Mike Kenna	64	8.9	78.1	14.1	7.8
Scott Oravec	85	11.8	60.0	22.4	17.6
Kirk Schwalm	92	12.8	76.1	15.2	8.7
John Foster Wallace	103	14.3	80.6	13.6	5.8

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>
Maria Pia L. Bahr	134	4.4	5.0	1.0	96	4.6	5.0	0.8
Andrew Patrick Baldock	91	3.4	4.0	1.2	76	3.4	4.0	1.3
Trisha Haines	86	4.2	4.0	1.0	73	4.1	4.0	1.0
Steven Hansen	117	4.3	5.0	0.9	91	4.3	5.0	1.0
Jennifer Page Hite	161	4.2	5.0	1.2	130	4.2	5.0	1.2
Mike Kenna	62	2.9	3.0	1.1	49	2.9	3.0	1.2
Scott Oravec	84	3.9	4.0	1.0	51	4.0	4.0	1.1
Kirk Schwalm	91	3.8	4.0	1.1	69	3.9	4.0	1.1
John Foster Wallace	100	3.9	4.0	1.1	81	3.9	4.0	1.1

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>	%
Maria Pia L. Bahr	96	1	1.0	2	2.1	6	6.3	16	16.7	71	74.0
Andrew Patrick Baldock	76	6	7.9	16	21.1	14	18.4	22	28.9	18	23.7
Trisha Haines	73	2	2.7	2	2.7	13	17.8	23	31.5	33	45.2
Steven Hansen	91	1	1.1	6	6.6	9	9.9	21	23.1	54	59.3
Jennifer Page Hite	130	6	4.6	15	11.5	7	5.4	25	19.2	77	59.2
Mike Kenna	49	7	14.3	12	24.5	10	20.4	17	34.7	3	6.1
Scott Oravec	51	2	3.9	5	9.8	6	11.8	18	35.3	20	39.2
Kirk Schwalm	69	2	2.9	6	8.7	19	27.5	14	20.3	28	40.6
John Foster Wallace	81	1	1.2	10	12.3	15	18.5	25	30.9	30	37.0

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Maria Pia L. Bahr	6	4.8	5	4.6	12	4.4	2	4.0	13	4.3	46	4.7	4	5.0	-	-	7	4.6	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	4	3.3	11	3.2	3	2.0	-	-	18	3.3	31	3.6	3	2.3	-	-	5	3.8	3.4
Trisha Haines	2	4.5	7	2.9	4	3.5	-	-	15	4.3	39	4.3	-	-	1	4.0	4	4.3	4.1
Steven Hansen	9	4.3	12	3.5	9	4.9	-	-	15	4.7	37	4.3	3	5.0	-	-	5	3.8	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	9	3.8	14	4.5	3	3.7	-	-	22	4.8	63	4.0	5	3.4	3	5.0	10	4.1	4.2
Mike Kenna	-	-	9	3.2	2	3.5	-	-	12	3.3	20	2.7	4	2.5	-	-	2	2.0	2.9
Scott Oravec	8	4.6	5	3.6	3	3.3	-	-	12	4.1	16	4.2	-	-	-	-	6	2.7	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	7	3.1	13	4.5	8	4.3	-	-	18	3.7	16	3.9	1	2.0	1	3.0	4	4.3	3.9
John Foster Wallace	11	4.0	20	4.2	10	4.1	-	-	17	3.5	13	3.5	1	4.0	2	5.0	7	4.3	3.9

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>	
Maria Pia L. Bahr	5	4.6	17	4.9	13	4.6	10	4.4	49	4.5	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	12	3.4	13	3.2	16	3.3	9	3.1	24	3.6	3.4
Trisha Haines	9	4.6	18	3.9	13	4.0	9	4.1	22	4.2	4.1
Steven Hansen	13	4.5	20	4.4	25	4.3	8	4.3	23	4.2	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	24	3.9	25	4.3	28	4.0	13	4.4	37	4.4	4.2
Mike Kenna	6	2.7	10	2.6	11	3.5	4	3.3	17	2.8	2.9
Scott Oravec	4	4.3	6	4.3	8	4.6	7	3.9	23	3.7	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	9	3.8	13	4.0	9	3.7	4	4.3	32	3.9	3.9
John Foster Wallace	5	3.6	11	3.1	7	3.7	9	3.8	48	4.2	3.9

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>
Maria Pia L. Bahr	7	4.4	6	4.7	18	4.4	58	4.7	7	4.7	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	15	4.1	11	2.9	36	3.2	9	3.3	4	3.8	3.4
Trisha Haines	20	4.5	14	4.4	28	3.9	9	3.7	1	5.0	4.1
Steven Hansen	9	3.2	19	4.6	38	4.4	22	4.3	1	5.0	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	17	2.6	31	4.3	51	4.4	28	4.6	2	4.5	4.2
Mike Kenna	1	4.0	2	2.5	20	2.9	24	3.0	2	3.0	2.9
Scott Oravec	8	3.9	5	3.2	23	3.9	12	4.3	1	4.0	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	8	4.1	3	3.3	31	3.9	25	4.0	1	2.0	3.9
John Foster Wallace	5	3.2	1	3.0	32	3.7	40	4.1	3	4.7	3.9

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>	
Maria Pia L. Bahr	9	4.6	-	-	77	4.7	8	3.5	2	5.0	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	1	2.0	5	3.6	14	4.0	55	3.2	-	-	3.4
Trisha Haines	-	-	4	4.3	26	4.5	42	3.9	-	-	4.1
Steven Hansen	6	4.7	6	4.7	18	4.7	58	4.1	1	5.0	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	6	4.2	7	4.7	46	4.2	69	4.1	1	4.0	4.2
Mike Kenna	-	-	-	-	12	2.9	37	2.9	-	-	2.9
Scott Oravec	3	4.3	1	4.0	13	4.2	30	3.7	2	4.5	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	-	-	2	4.0	7	4.4	59	3.8	-	-	3.9
John Foster Wallace	3	5.0	1	5.0	11	3.5	66	3.9	-	-	3.9

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Maria Pia L. Bahr	50	4.6	45	4.6	4.6
Andrew Patrick Baldock	42	3.3	31	3.5	3.4
Trisha Haines	39	4.0	3.1	4.3	4.1
Steven Hansen	49	4.3	39	4.3	4.3
Jennifer Page Hite	66	4.1	62	4.2	4.2
Mike Kenna	18	3.1	30	2.9	2.9
Scott Oravec	29	3.9	20	4.1	4.0
Kirk Schwalm	39	4.2	27	3.6	3.9
John Foster Wallace	47	3.9	31	3.8	3.9

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

Table 11
María Pia L. Bahr
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	137	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	98	71.5
Professional reputation	24	17.5
Other personal contacts	15	10.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	90	91.8
Substantial amount of experience	39	39.8
Moderate amount of experience	30	30.6
Limited amount of experience	29	29.6
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	13	9.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	7.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	15	10.9
Private, corporate employee	2	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	18	13.1
Government	58	42.3
Public service agency or organization	4	2.9
Retired	1	0.7
Other	15	10.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.2
5 years or fewer	7	5.1
6 to 10 years	22	16.1
11 to 15 years	18	13.1
16 to 20 years	12	8.8
More than 20 years	75	54.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	9	6.6
Criminal	8	5.8
Mixed criminal & civil	37	27.0
Civil	70	51.1
Other	13	9.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	9	6.6
Second District	-	-
Third District	105	76.6
Fourth District	21	15.3
Outside Alaska	2	1.5
Gender		
No response	1	0.7
Male	68	49.6
Female	68	49.6

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

Table 12
Maria Pia L. Bahr
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	137	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	98	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	90	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	8	4.1	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	39	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	30	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.8
Limited amount of experience	29	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	24	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.3
Other personal contacts	15	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	13	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.3
Government	46	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.7
Public service agency or organization	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.6
6 to 10 years	18	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9
11 to 15 years	13	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
16 to 20 years	10	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.4
More than 20 years	50	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.3	4.4
Criminal	6	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	20	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Civil	58	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.7
Other	7	4.6	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.4	4.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	9	4.4	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.6
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	78	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7
Fourth District	9	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.5
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	51	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Female	46	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.6

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

Table 13**Andrew Patrick Baldock****Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	93	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	78	83.9
Professional reputation	12	12.9
Other personal contacts	3	3.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	68	87.2
Substantial amount of experience	43	55.1
Moderate amount of experience	22	28.2
Limited amount of experience	13	16.7
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
Private, solo	7	7.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	14.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	5.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	19.4
Government	37	39.8
Public service agency or organization	3	3.2
Retired	9	9.7
Other	18	19.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.2
5 years or fewer	14	15.1
6 to 10 years	16	17.2
11 to 15 years	16	17.2
16 to 20 years	11	11.8
More than 20 years	34	36.6
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1
Prosecution	15	16.1
Criminal	12	12.9
Mixed criminal & civil	42	45.2
Civil	19	20.4
Other	4	4.3
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	1	1.1
Second District	5	5.4
Third District	16	17.2
Fourth District	70	75.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	3	3.2
Male	50	53.8
Female	40	43.0

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

Table 14

Andrew Patrick Baldock

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	93	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	78	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.4
Experience within last 5 years	68	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.4
Experience not within last 5 years	10	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	43	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.7	3.4
Moderate amount of experience	22	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.2
Limited amount of experience	13	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.6
Professional reputation	12	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.5
Other personal contacts	3	3.0	3.7	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	3.8	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	3.6	3.4	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.0	2.0	2.7	3.0	1.7	2.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.7	3.3
Government	32	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.6
Public service agency or organization	3	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.7	2.3
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	12	4.0	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.4
6 to 10 years	14	3.7	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.2
11 to 15 years	16	3.9	3.6	3.1	2.9	3.5	3.3
16 to 20 years	9	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.1
More than 20 years	25	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	15	4.5	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.1
Criminal	11	3.6	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.3	2.9
Mixed criminal & civil	37	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.3	3.2
Civil	10	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3
Other	4	4.3	4.3	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Second District	5	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6
Third District	15	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0
Fourth District	56	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.5	3.2
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	44	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.3
Female	31	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.8	3.5

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

Table 15
Trisha Haines
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	86	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	73	84.9
Professional reputation	12	14.0
Other personal contacts	1	1.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	64	87.7
Substantial amount of experience	29	40.3
Moderate amount of experience	25	34.7
Limited amount of experience	18	25.0
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.2
Private, solo	3	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	9.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	5.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	19.8
Government	45	52.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	1	1.2
Other	6	7.0
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.3
5 years or fewer	11	12.8
6 to 10 years	20	23.3
11 to 15 years	15	17.4
16 to 20 years	9	10.5
More than 20 years	29	33.7
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.2
Prosecution	21	24.4
Criminal	15	17.4
Mixed criminal & civil	33	38.4
Civil	15	17.4
Other	1	1.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.2
First District	-	-
Second District	4	4.7
Third District	33	38.4
Fourth District	48	55.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	3	3.5
Male	48	55.8
Female	35	40.7

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

Table 16
Trisha Haines
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	86	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	73	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	64	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	3.9	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	9	4.7	4.6	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9
Substantial amount of experience	29	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	25	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1
Limited amount of experience	18	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.7
Professional reputation	12	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.1	2.9	2.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.5	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3
Government	39	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Other	4	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.6
6 to 10 years	18	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.9
11 to 15 years	13	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.0
16 to 20 years	9	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.7	4.1
More than 20 years	22	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	20	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.5
Criminal	14	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.9
Civil	9	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	4	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3
Third District	26	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5
Fourth District	42	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	39	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.0
Female	31	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.3

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

Table 17
Steven Hansen
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	119	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	92	77.3
Professional reputation	19	16.0
Other personal contacts	8	6.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	84	91.3
Substantial amount of experience	42	45.7
Moderate amount of experience	36	39.1
Limited amount of experience	14	15.2
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	13	10.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	13.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	10.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	15.1
Government	44	37.0
Public service agency or organization	5	4.2
Retired	1	0.8
Other	9	7.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.5
5 years or fewer	16	13.4
6 to 10 years	25	21.0
11 to 15 years	27	22.7
16 to 20 years	13	10.9
More than 20 years	35	29.4
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.7
Prosecution	11	9.2
Criminal	23	19.3
Mixed criminal & civil	47	39.5
Civil	34	28.6
Other	2	1.7
Location of Practice		
No response	2	1.7
First District	7	5.9
Second District	6	5.0
Third District	30	25.2
Fourth District	73	61.3
Outside Alaska	1	0.8
Gender		
No response	4	3.4
Male	65	54.6
Female	50	42.0

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

Table 18
Steven Hansen
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	119	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	92	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	84	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	8	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	42	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	36	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	14	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8
Professional reputation	19	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2
Other personal contacts	8	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.7
Government	37	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	4	4.8	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	14	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.5
6 to 10 years	20	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
11 to 15 years	25	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3
16 to 20 years	8	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
More than 20 years	23	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.2
Criminal	19	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	38	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Civil	23	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
Other	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7
Second District	6	4.7	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Third District	18	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.7
Fourth District	59	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	49	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3
Female	40	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3

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

Table 19
Jennifer Page Hite
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	162	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	131	80.9
Professional reputation	27	16.7
Other personal contacts	4	2.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	111	84.7
Substantial amount of experience	74	56.9
Moderate amount of experience	40	30.8
Limited amount of experience	16	12.3
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
Private, solo	14	8.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	11.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.7
Private, corporate employee	1	0.6
Judge or judicial officer	25	15.4
Government	70	43.2
Public service agency or organization	9	5.6
Retired	3	1.9
Other	15	9.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	1.9
5 years or fewer	29	17.9
6 to 10 years	27	16.7
11 to 15 years	29	17.9
16 to 20 years	19	11.7
More than 20 years	55	34.0
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.6
Prosecution	17	10.5
Criminal	35	21.6
Mixed criminal & civil	60	37.0
Civil	44	27.2
Other	5	3.1
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
First District	7	4.3
Second District	7	4.3
Third District	57	35.2
Fourth District	89	54.9
Outside Alaska	1	0.6
Gender		
No response	4	2.5
Male	77	47.5
Female	81	50.0

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

Table 20
Jennifer Page Hite
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	162	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	131	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	111	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	19	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	74	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	40	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	16	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.9	3.7
Professional reputation	27	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.1
Other personal contacts	4	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.4	4.0	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.7	4.7	4.4	3.8	4.4	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.7	4.3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.8
Government	63	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.0
Public service agency or organization	6	4.6	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.4
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0
Other	10	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	25	4.5	3.9	3.8	3.7	4.2	3.9
6 to 10 years	25	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.3
11 to 15 years	28	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.7	4.1	4.0
16 to 20 years	13	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.4
More than 20 years	37	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	17	3.7	2.5	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.6
Criminal	31	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	51	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.4
Civil	29	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.6
Other	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2
Second District	7	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.7
Third District	46	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	70	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.1
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	66	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.1
Female	63	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.2

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

Table 21
Mike Kenna
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	64	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	50	78.1
Professional reputation	9	14.1
Other personal contacts	5	7.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	48	96.0
Substantial amount of experience	19	38.8
Moderate amount of experience	17	34.7
Limited amount of experience	13	26.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	15.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	6.3
Private, corporate employee	1	1.6
Judge or judicial officer	14	21.9
Government	24	37.5
Public service agency or organization	5	7.8
Retired	-	-
Other	3	4.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.6
5 years or fewer	9	14.1
6 to 10 years	14	21.9
11 to 15 years	12	18.8
16 to 20 years	7	10.9
More than 20 years	21	32.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	2	3.1
Criminal	3	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	26	40.6
Civil	29	45.3
Other	4	6.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	14	21.9
Fourth District	50	78.1
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.6
Male	25	39.1
Female	38	59.4

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

Table 22
Mike Kenna
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	64	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.8	2.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	50	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Experience within last 5 years	48	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	19	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1
Moderate amount of experience	17	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.1	2.2
Limited amount of experience	13	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7
Professional reputation	9	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6
Other personal contacts	5	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.3
Government	20	3.0	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7
Public service agency or organization	4	2.8	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.0	2.5
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.2	2.6	2.7
6 to 10 years	11	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.6
11 to 15 years	11	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.5
16 to 20 years	4	3.0	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3
More than 20 years	17	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.1	2.7	2.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Criminal	2	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5
Mixed criminal & civil	21	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.6	2.9
Civil	24	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.0
Other	2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	13	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.9
Fourth District	37	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.9	2.9
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	18	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.1
Female	31	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.9

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

Table 23
Scott Oravec
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	85	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	51	60.0
Professional reputation	19	22.4
Other personal contacts	15	17.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	74.0
Substantial amount of experience	15	29.4
Moderate amount of experience	20	39.2
Limited amount of experience	16	31.4
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.2
Private, solo	11	12.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	14.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	9.4
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2
Judge or judicial officer	17	20.0
Government	21	24.7
Public service agency or organization	3	3.5
Retired	1	1.2
Other	10	11.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	3.5
5 years or fewer	8	9.4
6 to 10 years	7	8.2
11 to 15 years	12	14.1
16 to 20 years	13	15.3
More than 20 years	42	49.4
Cases Handled		
No response	2	2.4
Prosecution	9	10.6
Criminal	6	7.1
Mixed criminal & civil	32	37.6
Civil	33	38.8
Other	3	3.5
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.4
First District	4	4.7
Second District	1	1.2
Third District	20	23.5
Fourth District	55	64.7
Outside Alaska	3	3.5
Gender		
No response	2	2.4
Male	47	55.3
Female	36	42.4

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

Table 24
Scott Oravec
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	85	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	51	3.9	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	37	3.7	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.8	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	13	4.4	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	15	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	20	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	16	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.6
Professional reputation	19	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.7
Other personal contacts	15	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	4.0	4.7	4.6	4.4	3.9	4.1
Government	16	3.8	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	6	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.7
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.0	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3
6 to 10 years	6	4.0	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.3
11 to 15 years	8	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.6
16 to 20 years	7	3.6	4.6	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.9
More than 20 years	23	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	3.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9
Criminal	5	3.6	3.8	3.4	4.0	3.4	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	23	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.3	3.8	3.9
Civil	12	4.2	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.3
Other	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.0	4.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.3
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Third District	13	3.8	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	30	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Gender*							
Male	29	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.9
Female	20	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.1

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

Table 25
Kirk Schwalm
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	92	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	70	76.1
Professional reputation	14	15.2
Other personal contacts	8	8.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	56	82.4
Substantial amount of experience	25	35.7
Moderate amount of experience	29	41.4
Limited amount of experience	16	22.9
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
Private, solo	10	10.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	19.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	9.8
Private, corporate employee	1	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	19	20.7
Government	23	25.0
Public service agency or organization	2	2.2
Retired	1	1.1
Other	8	8.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.2
5 years or fewer	12	13.0
6 to 10 years	16	17.4
11 to 15 years	12	13.0
16 to 20 years	8	8.7
More than 20 years	42	45.7
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1
Prosecution	9	9.8
Criminal	3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	38	41.3
Civil	39	42.4
Other	2	2.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	-	-
Second District	2	2.2
Third District	13	14.1
Fourth District	75	81.5
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	3	3.3
Male	53	57.6
Female	36	39.1

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

Table 26
Kirk Schwalm
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	92	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	70	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	56	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	12	4.1	4.3	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	25	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.7	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	29	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Limited amount of experience	16	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.1	3.6	3.7
Professional reputation	14	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Other personal contacts	8	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	4.0	4.4	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.7
Government	17	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.9
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Retired	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Other	4	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.8
6 to 10 years	13	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0
11 to 15 years	10	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.7
16 to 20 years	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	32	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.1
Criminal	3	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	31	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.9
Civil	26	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.0
Other	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Third District	8	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.4
Fourth District	59	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	40	4.1	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.2
Female	27	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.6

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

Table 27
John Foster Wallace
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	103	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	83	80.6
Professional reputation	14	13.6
Other personal contacts	6	5.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	69	86.3
Substantial amount of experience	34	41.0
Moderate amount of experience	28	33.7
Limited amount of experience	21	25.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	15	14.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	23	22.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	12.6
Private, corporate employee	1	1.0
Judge or judicial officer	18	17.5
Government	17	16.5
Public service agency or organization	3	2.9
Retired	4	3.9
Other	9	8.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.0
5 years or fewer	9	8.7
6 to 10 years	12	11.7
11 to 15 years	9	8.7
16 to 20 years	12	11.7
More than 20 years	60	58.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	7	6.8
Criminal	3	2.9
Mixed criminal & civil	38	36.9
Civil	49	47.6
Other	6	5.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	5	4.9
Second District	1	1.0
Third District	17	16.5
Fourth District	78	75.7
Outside Alaska	2	1.9
Gender		
No response	3	2.9
Male	61	59.2
Female	39	37.9

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

Table 28
John Foster Wallace
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	103	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	83	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	69	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	11	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	34	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	28	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.6
Limited amount of experience	21	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7
Professional reputation	14	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Other personal contacts	6	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.2	3.6	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	11	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	20	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	3.8	3.5	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.5
Government	14	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.5
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	5.0
Other	7	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.2	3.4	4.4	4.0	4.4	3.6
6 to 10 years	12	3.5	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.1
11 to 15 years	7	3.9	3.9	4.6	4.0	3.9	3.7
16 to 20 years	9	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.8
More than 20 years	49	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	4.0	3.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.2
Criminal	1	4.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	32	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.7
Civil	42	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1
Other	3	4.3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.8	5.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Third District	11	3.7	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.5
Fourth District	67	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	49	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9
Female	31	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8

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