



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Alaska Court of Appeals**

### **Technical Report**

Alliana Salangit, BA  
Ashley Hannigan, MA  
Rosyland Frazier, MSPH

*November 16-20, 2020*

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 Ratings on the “Overall” Variable.....	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 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: Brooke Berens: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	16
Table 12: Brooke Berens: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Trisha Haines: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Trisha Haines: Detailed Responses .....	19
Table 15: Ben Hofmeister: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Ben Hofmeister: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 17: Paul J. Miovas, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	22
Table 18: Paul J. Miovas, Jr.: Detailed Responses .....	23
Table 19: Kevin M. Saxby: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Kevin M. Saxby: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 21: Michal Stryszak: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	26
Table 22: Michal Stryszak: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 23: Timothy W. Terrell: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	28
Table 24: Timothy W. Terrell: Detailed Responses .....	29

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Alaska Court of Appeals created by the Legislature. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of nine applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Brooke Berens, Trisha Haines, Ben Hofmeister, Paul J. Miovas, Jr., Chris Peloso, David L. Roghair, Kevin M. Saxby, Michal Stryszak, and Timothy W. Terrell. Chris Peloso and David L. Roghair withdrew their applications. Therefore, their 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 on all six characteristics.

**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>Brooke Berens</b>	126	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	65	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	166	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	145	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	176	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	116	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	139	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6

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

# 2020 Judicial Selection Survey, Alaska Court of Appeals

## *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 selection survey was conducted for a vacancy on the Alaska Court of Appeals created by the Alaska State Legislature. This report presents the findings from this survey. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of 9 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Brooke Berens, Trisha Haines, Ben Hofmeister, Paul J. Miovas, Jr., Chris Peloso, David L. Roghair, Kevin M. Saxby, Michal Stryszak, and Timothy W. Terrell. Chris Peloso and David L. Roghair withdrew their applications. Therefore, their 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 3,513 individuals invited to participate, most individuals, 3,500, received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Six individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 7 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 885 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; 46 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question or did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online surveys were returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 839 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned six paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper surveys were excluded because they were unsigned. No paper surveys were 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, 6 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 839 online surveys and six paper surveys, for a total of 845 surveys and a survey return rate of 24.0%. Of the 845 returned surveys, 382 (45.2%) did not rate any of the nine applicants to the Alaska Court of Appeals; 463 (54.8%) 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	
		n	%	n	%
		<b>845</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>					
	No response	4	.5	2	0.4
	Private, solo	178	21.1	78	16.8
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	89	10.5	35	7.6
	Private, 6+ attorneys	79	9.3	36	7.8
	Private, corporate employee	24	2.8	10	2.2
	Judge or judicial officer	83	9.8	64	13.8
	Government	214	25.3	165	35.6
	Public service agency or organization	32	3.8	16	3.5
	Retired	15	1.8	6	1.3
	Other	127	15.0	51	11.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>					
	No response	29	3.4	10	2.2
	5 years or fewer	74	8.8	36	7.8
	6 to 10 years	99	11.7	72	15.6
	11 to 15 years	99	11.7	71	15.3
	16 to 20 years	75	8.9	53	11.4
	More than 20 years	469	55.5	221	47.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>					
	No response	3	.4	2	0.4
	Prosecution	63	7.5	59	12.7
	Criminal	82	9.7	72	15.6
	Mixed criminal & civil	205	24.3	133	28.7
	Civil	420	49.7	170	36.7
	Other	72	8.5	27	5.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>					
	No response	9	1.1	4	0.9
	First District	114	13.5	66	14.3
	Second District	12	1.4	7	1.5
	Third District	597	70.7	341	73.7
	Fourth District	77	9.1	35	7.6
	Outside Alaska	36	4.3	10	2.2
<b>Gender</b>					
	No response	16	1.9	9	1.9
	Male	497	58.8	263	56.8
	Female	332	39.3	191	41.3

## *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>
<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.

## ***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 11-24 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

**Table 3**  
**Level of Experience with the Applicants**

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b>Brooke Berens</b>	158	18.7%	79.7	19.0	1.3
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	79	9.3%	82.3	17.7	-
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	206	24.4%	80.6	15.5	3.9
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	182	21.5%	79.7	17.0	3.3
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	223	26.4%	78.9	19.3	1.8
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	142	16.8%	81.7	9.9	8.5
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	171	20.2%	81.3	14.6	4.1

**Table 4**  
**Summary of Ratings on the “Overall” Variable**

	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>
<b>Brooke Berens</b>	154	4.4	5.0	1.0	125	4.5	5.0	0.9
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	76	3.9	4.0	1.1	64	4.0	4.0	1.1
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	204	4.3	5.0	0.8	165	4.3	5.0	0.8
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	180	3.8	4.0	1.1	143	3.8	4.0	1.1
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	221	3.7	4.0	1.2	175	3.7	4.0	1.2
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	139	3.7	4.0	1.1	115	3.6	4.0	1.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	169	4.5	5.0	0.8	139	4.6	5.0	0.8

**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>Brooke Berens</b>	125	3	2.4	3	2.4	8	6.4	24	19.2	87	69.6
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	64	1	1.6	7	10.9	10	15.6	20	31.3	26	40.6
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	165	-	-	6	3.6	20	12.1	54	32.7	85	51.5
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	143	1	0.7	21	14.7	30	21.0	46	32.2	45	31.5
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	175	7	4.0	24	13.7	48	27.4	39	22.3	57	32.6
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	115	5	4.3	19	16.5	23	20.0	37	32.2	31	27.0
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	139	1	0.7	5	3.6	10	7.2	20	14.4	103	74.1

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>Brooke Berens</b>	20	4.5	5	4.6	6	4.7	-	-	18	4.6	63	4.5	3	5.0	1	5.0	9	4.0	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	4	4.5	2	4.0	3	4.3	-	-	13	4.5	35	3.9	2	3.0	1	5.0	3	3.0	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	18	4.2	14	4.1	7	4.7	4	5.0	24	4.2	68	4.4	7	3.7	3	4.0	19	4.5	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	8	3.4	9	3.6	7	3.0	2	4.5	21	3.8	78	4.0	5	2.8	2	2.5	11	4.1	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	21	4.0	13	3.5	13	3.5	2	4.0	26	3.8	76	3.4	2	3.0	2	5.0	20	4.4	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	11	3.1	10	3.3	5	2.8	2	5.0	18	3.7	56	3.8	2	3.0	1	4.0	9	3.7	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	15	4.6	8	3.5	4	3.8	4	5.0	25	4.5	58	4.8	3	4.0	1	5.0	20	4.7	4.6

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

**Table 7**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Length of 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>Brooke Berens</b>	12	4.8	19	4.7	22	4.6	13	4.6	57	4.3	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	5	3.8	13	3.7	12	4.0	7	4.1	26	4.2	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	5	4.2	21	4.3	32	4.3	24	4.5	81	4.3	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	11	4.3	29	3.7	29	3.7	15	3.9	57	3.8	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	16	3.2	20	3.4	21	3.1	21	4.1	92	3.8	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	3	4.7	17	3.5	25	3.6	15	4.1	53	3.4	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	3	5.0	14	4.9	22	4.7	20	4.7	77	4.5	4.6

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>Brooke Berens</b>	13	4.0	43	4.8	44	4.3	19	4.7	6	4.2	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	20	4.0	14	4.4	20	3.7	6	4.0	3	4.3	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	30	4.6	25	3.8	49	4.1	51	4.6	10	4.4	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	39	4.1	31	3.4	47	3.7	19	4.0	7	3.6	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	28	3.3	39	3.2	55	3.9	45	4.0	7	4.1	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	31	3.9	29	3.3	37	3.3	11	4.4	7	3.9	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	36	4.8	24	4.5	44	4.4	24	4.7	10	4.4	4.6

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>Brooke Berens</b>	8	4.8	-	-	105	4.5	8	4.3	3	3.7	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	2	2.5	2	4.5	38	3.9	19	4.3	1	4.0	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	30	4.4	2	4.5	123	4.3	9	4.2	-	-	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	9	3.9	-	-	127	3.8	3	3.3	2	3.0	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	5	4.6	-	-	158	3.6	8	4.0	3	4.3	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	2	4.5	1	5.0	106	3.6	3	3.3	2	3.0	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	4	4.5	2	5.0	119	4.6	9	4.7	3	4.7	4.6

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>	
<b>Brooke Berens</b>	60	4.5	62	4.5	4.5
<b>Trisha Haines</b>	33	3.8	29	4.2	4.0
<b>Ben Hofmeister</b>	97	4.3	66	4.3	4.3
<b>Paul J. Miovas, Jr.</b>	89	4.0	53	3.5	3.8
<b>Kevin M. Saxby</b>	113	3.8	60	3.4	3.7
<b>Michal Stryszak</b>	73	3.7	41	3.3	3.6
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	77	4.6	58	4.5	4.6

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

**Table 11**  
**Brooke Berens**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	126	79.7
Professional reputation	30	19.0
Other personal contacts	2	1.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	111	88.1
Substantial amount of experience	54	42.9
Moderate amount of experience	47	37.3
Limited amount of experience	25	19.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.6
Private, solo	24	15.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	6.3
Private, corporate employee	1	0.6
Judge or judicial officer	20	12.7
Government	78	49.4
Public service agency or organization	6	3.8
Retired	2	1.3
Other	9	5.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.3
5 years or fewer	15	9.5
6 to 10 years	29	18.4
11 to 15 years	28	17.7
16 to 20 years	16	10.1
More than 20 years	68	43.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	17	10.8
Criminal	53	33.5
Mixed criminal & civil	48	30.4
Civil	32	20.3
Other	8	5.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.6
First District	8	5.1
Second District	-	-
Third District	136	86.1
Fourth District	8	5.1
Outside Alaska	5	3.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	1.9
Male	79	50.0
Female	76	48.1

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

**Table 12**  
**Brooke Berens**  
**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	158	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	111	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	15	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	54	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	47	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	25	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Professional reputation	30	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	20	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.7	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Government	64	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	9	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	12	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.8
6 to 10 years	20	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.7
11 to 15 years	22	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
16 to 20 years	13	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6
More than 20 years	57	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	14	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.0
Criminal	43	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	44	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3
Civil	19	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.7
Other	6	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	8	5.0	4.9	4.4	4.5	4.9	4.8
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	106	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Fourth District	8	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3
Outside Alaska	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	61	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Female	62	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5

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

**Table 13**  
**Trisha Haines**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	65	82.3
Professional reputation	14	17.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	57	87.7
Substantial amount of experience	29	45.3
Moderate amount of experience	17	26.6
Limited amount of experience	18	28.1
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.3
Private, solo	6	7.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	5.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	17.7
Government	45	57.0
Public service agency or organization	2	2.5
Retired	1	1.3
Other	3	3.8
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.3
5 years or fewer	9	11.4
6 to 10 years	16	20.3
11 to 15 years	15	19.0
16 to 20 years	9	11.4
More than 20 years	29	36.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.3
Prosecution	22	27.8
Criminal	20	25.3
Mixed criminal & civil	22	27.8
Civil	11	13.9
Other	3	3.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	2	2.5
First District	3	3.8
Second District	2	2.5
Third District	49	62.0
Fourth District	21	26.6
Outside Alaska	2	2.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	3.8
Male	42	53.2
Female	34	43.0

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

**Table 14**  
**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	79	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	57	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	8	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.6	3.6	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	29	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.4	4.6	4.2	3.9	3.4	3.7
Limited amount of experience	18	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3	3.7	3.8
Professional reputation	14	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	4	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.0	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Government	36	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.9
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	3	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.3	2.7	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	6	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.8	3.8
6 to 10 years	13	4.2	4.4	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.7
11 to 15 years	12	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.4	3.8	4.0
16 to 20 years	7	4.9	4.7	4.6	5.0	3.7	4.1
More than 20 years	26	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	20	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.3	3.7	4.0
Criminal	14	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	21	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.7
Civil	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.5	3.8	4.0
Other	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.5
Second District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Third District	38	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9
Fourth District	20	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.3
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	-	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	33	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.8
Female	30	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2

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

**Table 15**  
**Ben Hofmeister**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	166	80.6
Professional reputation	32	15.5
Other personal contacts	8	3.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	105	63.6
Substantial amount of experience	56	33.7
Moderate amount of experience	73	44.0
Limited amount of experience	36	21.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.5
Private, solo	22	10.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	8.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	5.8
Private, corporate employee	6	2.9
Judge or judicial officer	31	15.0
Government	83	40.3
Public service agency or organization	9	4.4
Retired	4	1.9
Other	21	10.2
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.0
5 years or fewer	8	3.9
6 to 10 years	27	13.1
11 to 15 years	39	18.9
16 to 20 years	32	15.5
More than 20 years	98	47.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	37	18.0
Criminal	31	15.0
Mixed criminal & civil	56	27.2
Civil	69	33.5
Other	13	6.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.5
First District	39	18.9
Second District	2	1.0
Third District	151	73.3
Fourth District	11	5.3
Outside Alaska	2	1.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	1.0
Male	118	57.3
Female	86	41.7

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

**Table 16**  
**Ben Hofmeister**  
**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	206	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	105	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	60	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	56	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	73	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Limited amount of experience	36	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	32	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3
Other personal contacts	8	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	18	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7
Private, corporate employee	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	24	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2
Government	68	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.4
Public service agency or organization	7	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.7
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	4.0
Other	19	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2
6 to 10 years	21	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
11 to 15 years	32	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	25	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.3	4.5
More than 20 years	81	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	30	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6
Criminal	25	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	49	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.1
Civil	51	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
Other	11	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.2	4.4
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	30	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.5
Third District	124	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Fourth District	9	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.2
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	97	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Female	67	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3

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

**Table 17**  
**Paul J. Miovas, Jr.**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	145	79.7
Professional reputation	31	17.0
Other personal contacts	6	3.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	124	86.1
Substantial amount of experience	74	51.4
Moderate amount of experience	42	29.2
Limited amount of experience	28	19.4
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	16	8.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	6.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	6.0
Private, corporate employee	2	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	25	13.7
Government	93	51.1
Public service agency or organization	6	3.3
Retired	3	1.6
Other	14	7.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.1
5 years or fewer	16	8.8
6 to 10 years	34	18.7
11 to 15 years	34	18.7
16 to 20 years	26	14.3
More than 20 years	70	38.5
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	47	25.8
Criminal	36	19.8
Mixed criminal & civil	54	29.7
Civil	35	19.2
Other	10	5.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.1
First District	14	7.7
Second District	-	-
Third District	157	86.3
Fourth District	5	2.7
Outside Alaska	4	2.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.5
Male	105	57.7
Female	76	41.8

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



**Table 18**  
**Paul J. Miovas, Jr.**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	182	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8	3.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	124	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	20	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	74	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.7	4.0	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	42	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9
Limited amount of experience	28	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.3
Professional reputation	31	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8
Other personal contacts	6	4.8	4.7	4.3	3.8	4.5	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	10	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.1	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.9	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.0
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	21	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.8
Government	78	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.0	4.0
Public service agency or organization	5	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.4	3.2	2.8
Retired	2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
Other	11	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	11	4.4	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.4	4.3
6 to 10 years	30	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.7
11 to 15 years	29	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7
16 to 20 years	15	4.5	4.1	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.9
More than 20 years	58	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	39	4.6	4.5	4.3	3.7	4.1	4.1
Criminal	32	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	48	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7
Civil	19	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.7	4.1	4.0
Other	7	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.6
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	10	4.3	4.2	3.8	3.4	4.3	3.9
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	128	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8
Fourth District	3	3.3	3.7	3.0	2.3	3.7	3.3
Outside Alaska	2	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	90	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.0
Female	54	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.5

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

**Table 19**  
**Kevin M. Saxby**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	176	78.9
Professional reputation	43	19.3
Other personal contacts	4	1.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	138	78.4
Substantial amount of experience	85	48.6
Moderate amount of experience	56	32.0
Limited amount of experience	34	19.4
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.4
Private, solo	28	12.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	7.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	9.4
Private, corporate employee	3	1.3
Judge or judicial officer	31	13.9
Government	85	38.1
Public service agency or organization	5	2.2
Retired	2	0.9
Other	31	13.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	5	2.2
5 years or fewer	17	7.6
6 to 10 years	23	10.3
11 to 15 years	26	11.7
16 to 20 years	24	10.8
More than 20 years	128	57.4
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	0.4
Prosecution	31	13.9
Criminal	42	18.8
Mixed criminal & civil	63	28.3
Civil	76	34.1
Other	10	4.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.4
First District	8	3.6
Second District	1	0.4
Third District	199	89.2
Fourth District	9	4.0
Outside Alaska	5	2.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	0.9
Male	137	61.4
Female	84	37.7

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

**Table 20**  
**Kevin M. Saxby**  
**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	223	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	138	3.6	4.2	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	35	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	85	3.6	4.3	3.6	4.1	3.8	3.6
Moderate amount of experience	56	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.6
Limited amount of experience	34	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	43	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8
Other personal contacts	4	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	21	4.1	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	3.5	4.2	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.5
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	26	3.9	4.4	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8
Government	76	3.4	4.1	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.4
Public service agency or organization	2	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.0
Retired	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0
Other	21	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	16	3.3	3.9	3.2	3.9	3.3	3.2
6 to 10 years	20	3.6	4.4	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.4
11 to 15 years	21	3.0	4.2	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.1
16 to 20 years	21	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.1
More than 20 years	93	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	28	3.2	4.2	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.3
Criminal	39	3.3	4.0	3.1	3.8	3.5	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	55	3.9	4.2	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9
Civil	46	3.9	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0
Other	7	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	159	3.6	4.2	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.6
Fourth District	8	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
Outside Alaska	3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	114	3.8	4.3	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.8
Female	60	3.4	4.1	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.4

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

**Table 21**  
**Michal Stryszak**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	116	81.7
Professional reputation	14	9.9
Other personal contacts	12	8.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	83	72.8
Substantial amount of experience	58	50.4
Moderate amount of experience	33	28.7
Limited amount of experience	24	20.9
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	15	10.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	8.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	8.5
Private, corporate employee	2	1.4
Judge or judicial officer	21	14.8
Government	63	44.4
Public service agency or organization	4	2.8
Retired	2	1.4
Other	10	7.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.4
5 years or fewer	4	2.8
6 to 10 years	24	16.9
11 to 15 years	33	23.2
16 to 20 years	20	14.1
More than 20 years	59	41.5
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	33	23.2
Criminal	32	22.5
Mixed criminal & civil	41	28.9
Civil	25	17.6
Other	11	7.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.7
First District	4	2.8
Second District	1	0.7
Third District	127	89.4
Fourth District	4	2.8
Outside Alaska	5	3.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Male	87	61.3
Female	54	38.0

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

**Table 22**  
**Michal Stryszak**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	142	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	83	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	31	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	58	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	33	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.5
Limited amount of experience	24	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.5
Professional reputation	14	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.4
Other personal contacts	12	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.5
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	11	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	3.9	3.9	3.4	2.9	3.8	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.8
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	18	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.7
Government	56	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.8
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0
Retired	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other	9	4.1	4.4	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	5.0	4.7
6 to 10 years	17	4.0	4.4	4.1	3.5	3.9	3.5
11 to 15 years	26	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6
16 to 20 years	15	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1
More than 20 years	53	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	31	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.9
Criminal	29	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	38	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.3
Civil	11	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.4
Other	7	4.6	4.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	107	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.6
Fourth District	3	3.7	3.7	2.5	2.5	4.0	3.3
Outside Alaska	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	3.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	74	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.7
Female	41	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.3

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

**Table 23**  
**Timothy W. Terrell**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	139	81.3
Professional reputation	25	14.6
Other personal contacts	7	4.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 2 years)	93	68.4
Substantial amount of experience	60	43.2
Moderate amount of experience	42	30.2
Limited amount of experience	37	26.6
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.2
Private, solo	20	11.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	5.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	5.3
Private, corporate employee	4	2.3
Judge or judicial officer	29	17.0
Government	66	38.6
Public service agency or organization	4	2.3
Retired	2	1.2
Other	25	14.6
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	3	1.8
5 years or fewer	4	2.3
6 to 10 years	21	12.3
11 to 15 years	25	14.6
16 to 20 years	21	12.3
More than 20 years	97	56.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	0.6
Prosecution	42	24.6
Criminal	30	17.5
Mixed criminal & civil	51	29.8
Civil	36	21.1
Other	11	6.4
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.2
First District	6	3.5
Second District	2	1.2
Third District	144	84.2
Fourth District	12	7.0
Outside Alaska	5	2.9
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	4	2.3
Male	95	55.6
Female	72	42.1

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

**Table 24**  
**Timothy W. Terrell**  
**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	171	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	93	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	43	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	60	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	42	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	37	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	25	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	15	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.8
Private, corporate employee	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	25	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5
Government	58	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	20	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	14	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.9
11 to 15 years	22	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7
16 to 20 years	20	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.7
More than 20 years	77	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	36	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Criminal	24	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	44	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
Civil	24	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Other	10	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.4
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.5
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	119	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Fourth District	9	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.7
Outside Alaska	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	5.0	4.7
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	77	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	58	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5

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