



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Alaska Court of Appeals

Technical Report

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

November 3-7, 2025

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: RuthAnne Beach: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: RuthAnne Beach: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Lacey Jane Brewster: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Lacey Jane Brewster: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Patricia L. Haines: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Patricia L. Haines: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Chris Peloso: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Chris Peloso: Detailed Responses	23

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Alaska Court of Appeals created by the impending retirement of Judge Bethany Harbison. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): RuthAnne Beach, Lacey Jane Brewster, Patricia L. Haines, and Chris Peloso.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked bar members to evaluate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence*, *Integrity*, *Fairness*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each applicant by respondents with direct professional experience.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
RuthAnne Beach	68	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	117	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	143	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Chris Peloso	81	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.6

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

2025 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 single selection survey was conducted for one vacancy on the Alaska Court of Appeals created by the impending retirement of Judge Bethany Harbison; this report presents the findings of the survey. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): RuthAnne Beach, Lacey Jane Brewster, Patricia L. Haines, and Chris Peloso.

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 3,752 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,740) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 12 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 731 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; seven surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; four surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 720 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned three paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned. No paper survey was excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, three paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 720 online surveys and three paper surveys, for a total of 723 surveys and a survey return rate of 19.3%. Of the 723 returned surveys, 393 (54.4%) did not rate any of the four Alaska Court of Appeals applicants; 330 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

		All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents		723	100	330	45.6
Type of Practice					
	No response	2	0.3	-	-
	Private, solo	123	17.0	35	10.6
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	62	8.6	21	6.4
	Private, 6+ attorneys	86	11.9	27	8.2
	Private, corporate employee	19	2.6	3	0.9
	Judge or judicial officer	70	9.7	53	16.1
	Government	211	29.2	154	46.7
	Public service agency or organization	27	3.7	14	4.2
	Retired	109	15.1	17	5.2
	Other	14	1.9	6	1.8
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	37	5.1	4	1.2
	5 years or fewer	98	13.6	60	18.2
	6 to 10 years	57	7.9	32	9.7
	11 to 15 years	91	12.6	57	17.3
	16 to 20 years	71	9.8	41	12.4
	More than 20 years	369	51.0	136	41.2
Cases Handled					
	No response	5	0.7	1	0.3
	Prosecution	60	8.3	54	16.4
	Criminal	66	9.1	47	14.2
	Mixed criminal & civil	177	24.5	101	30.6
	Civil	360	49.8	114	34.5
	Other	55	7.6	13	3.9
Location of Practice					
	No response	3	0.4	-	-
	First District	97	13.4	56	17.0
	Second District	12	1.7	6	1.8
	Third District	482	66.7	202	61.2
	Fourth District	91	12.6	64	19.4
	Outside Alaska	38	5.3	2	0.6
Gender					
	No response	9	1.2	3	0.9
	Male	404	55.9	172	52.1
	Female	307	42.5	153	46.4
	Another identity	3	0.4	2	0.6

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

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

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

Data Management

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

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-18 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
RuthAnne Beach	91	12.6	74.7	23.1	2.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	156	21.6	75.0	21.8	3.2
Patricia L. Haines	180	24.9	79.4	19.4	1.1
Chris Peloso	117	16.2	69.2	28.2	2.6

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>
RuthAnne Beach	89	4.1	5.0	1.1	67	4.2	5.0	1.1
Lacey Jane Brewster	154	2.9	3.0	1.3	117	2.9	3.0	1.3
Patricia L. Haines	177	4.6	5.0	0.8	140	4.6	5.0	0.7
Chris Peloso	113	2.6	2.0	1.2	80	2.6	2.0	1.2

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	Poor			Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
RuthAnne Beach	67	1	1.5	5	7.5	11	16.4	10	14.9	40	59.7
Lacey Jane Brewster	117	15	12.8	42	35.9	23	19.7	15	12.8	22	18.8
Patricia L. Haines	140	-	-	5	3.6	6	4.3	26	18.6	103	73.6
Chris Peloso	80	14	17.5	30	37.5	17	21.3	11	13.8	8	10.0

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>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>	<i>M</i>
RuthAnne Beach	4	3.3	-	-	5	4.0	-	-	9	3.7	48	4.4	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	4	4.5	4	3.3	7	3.4	-	-	22	2.5	74	2.8	3	3.0	2	2.5	1	5.0	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	13	4.7	15	4.6	7	4.0	1	4.0	35	4.8	58	4.6	3	5.0	7	4.6	1	5.0	4.6
Chris Peloso	9	2.6	2	1.5	6	3.2	-	-	18	2.4	37	2.7	4	1.8	3	3.7	1	2.0	2.6

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>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>
RuthAnne Beach	15	4.3	9	3.9	14	4.4	8	4.4	21	4.2	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	23	3.4	15	2.8	20	2.9	20	3.0	38	2.6	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	16	4.9	14	4.6	24	4.5	18	4.6	67	4.6	4.6
Chris Peloso	12	2.9	8	2.5	18	2.6	7	3.1	33	2.4	2.6

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>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>	
RuthAnne Beach	32	4.8	14	3.6	13	3.5	7	4.1	1	5.0	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	29	2.5	31	3.3	36	3.0	19	2.5	2	3.5	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	17	4.6	18	4.6	57	4.6	44	4.6	3	5.0	4.6
Chris Peloso	10	2.4	13	2.5	27	2.9	26	2.5	4	2.0	2.6

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>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>	
RuthAnne Beach	1	5.0	1	5.0	58	4.2	6	4.2	1	5.0	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	6	2.3	3	3.3	95	2.9	13	3.3	-	-	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	8	4.5	5	4.8	71	4.5	56	4.7	-	-	4.6
Chris Peloso	39	2.7	-	-	36	2.5	4	2.5	1	5.0	2.6

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
RuthAnne Beach	32	4.3	35	4.1	-	-	4.2
Lacey Jane Brewster	59	3.0	58	2.7	-	-	2.9
Patricia L. Haines	81	4.6	57	4.6	+	+	4.6
Chris Peloso	35	3.1	43	2.3	-	-	2.6

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

Table 11
RuthAnne Beach
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	91	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	68	74.7
Professional reputation	21	23.1
Other personal contacts	2	2.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	63	92.6
Substantial amount of experience	25	36.8
Moderate amount of experience	27	39.7
Limited amount of experience	16	23.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	6	6.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	1.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	6.6
Private, corporate employee	2	2.2
Judge or judicial officer	11	12.1
Government	61	67.0
Public service agency or organization	1	1.1
Retired	2	2.2
Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	19	20.9
6 to 10 years	11	12.1
11 to 15 years	18	19.8
16 to 20 years	10	11.0
More than 20 years	33	36.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	38	41.8
Criminal	18	19.8
Mixed criminal & civil	16	17.6
Civil	16	17.6
Other	3	3.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	6	6.6
Second District	1	1.1
Third District	76	83.5
Fourth District	7	7.7
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	42	46.2
Female	49	53.8
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
RuthAnne Beach
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	91	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	68	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	63	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	5	4.0	5.0	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	25	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	27	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	16	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9
Professional reputation	21	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	2.5	2.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	3.6	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.4	3.8	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	3.9	4.3	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.7
Government	48	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	15	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
6 to 10 years	9	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.9
11 to 15 years	14	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	8	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.4
More than 20 years	22	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	32	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8
Criminal	14	3.6	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.6
Mixed criminal & civil	14	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.5
Civil	7	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.0	4.1
Other	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	59	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	6	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	32	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Female	36	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Lacey Jane Brewster
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	156	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	117	75.0
Professional reputation	34	21.8
Other personal contacts	5	3.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	109	93.2
Substantial amount of experience	55	47.0
Moderate amount of experience	38	32.5
Limited amount of experience	24	20.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	8	5.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	7.7
Private, corporate employee	2	1.3
Judge or judicial officer	25	16.0
Government	93	59.6
Public service agency or organization	4	2.6
Retired	3	1.9
Other	4	2.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	0.6
5 years or fewer	37	23.7
6 to 10 years	19	12.2
11 to 15 years	23	14.7
16 to 20 years	23	14.7
More than 20 years	53	34.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	37	23.7
Criminal	39	25.0
Mixed criminal & civil	41	26.3
Civil	34	21.8
Other	5	3.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	10	6.4
Second District	3	1.9
Third District	128	82.1
Fourth District	15	9.6
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	81	51.9
Female	74	47.4
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 14
Lacey Jane Brewster
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	156	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	117	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.9
Experience within last 5 years	109	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Experience not within last 5 years	8	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.3
Substantial amount of experience	55	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0
Moderate amount of experience	38	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.7
Limited amount of experience	24	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.8
Professional reputation	34	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9
Other personal contacts	5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	4.3	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.6	3.9	3.7	4.0	3.3	3.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.5
Government	74	3.4	3.4	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.8
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.7	3.0
Retired	2	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.5
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	23	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.4
6 to 10 years	15	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.8
11 to 15 years	20	3.4	3.7	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.9
16 to 20 years	20	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.1	3.0	3.0
More than 20 years	38	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	29	2.9	3.0	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.5
Criminal	31	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	36	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.0
Civil	19	3.3	3.2	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.5
Other	2	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.5	2.5	3.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	2.8	2.2	2.2	1.8	2.2	2.3
Second District	3	3.7	4.3	4.3	3.7	3.0	3.3
Third District	95	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.9
Fourth District	13	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	59	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.0
Female	58	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Patricia L. Haines
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	180	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	143	79.4
Professional reputation	35	19.4
Other personal contacts	2	1.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	134	93.7
Substantial amount of experience	58	40.6
Moderate amount of experience	45	31.5
Limited amount of experience	40	28.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	14	7.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	8.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	6.1
Private, corporate employee	3	1.7
Judge or judicial officer	43	23.9
Government	75	41.7
Public service agency or organization	6	3.3
Retired	9	5.0
Other	3	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.1
5 years or fewer	25	13.9
6 to 10 years	17	9.4
11 to 15 years	28	15.6
16 to 20 years	22	12.2
More than 20 years	86	47.8
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.6
Prosecution	24	13.3
Criminal	25	13.9
Mixed criminal & civil	69	38.3
Civil	56	31.1
Other	5	2.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	12	6.7
Second District	5	2.8
Third District	103	57.2
Fourth District	60	33.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	0.6
Male	95	52.8
Female	83	46.1
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 16
Patricia L. Haines
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	180	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	143	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	134	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	9	4.8	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.8	4.7
Substantial amount of experience	58	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	45	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	40	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3
Professional reputation	35	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	13	4.5	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	35	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Government	60	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.6
Public service agency or organization	4	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	17	4.8	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9
6 to 10 years	14	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	24	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
16 to 20 years	18	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
More than 20 years	69	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	18	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.8	4.6
Criminal	19	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	57	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6
Civil	45	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6
Other	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.7	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
Second District	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.8
Third District	73	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Fourth District	57	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	81	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
Female	60	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.6
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 17
Chris Peloso
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	117	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	81	69.2
Professional reputation	33	28.2
Other personal contacts	3	2.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	69	85.2
Substantial amount of experience	19	23.5
Moderate amount of experience	29	35.8
Limited amount of experience	33	40.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	14	12.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	6.0
Private, corporate employee	2	1.7
Judge or judicial officer	21	17.9
Government	55	47.0
Public service agency or organization	6	5.1
Retired	7	6.0
Other	1	0.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.7
5 years or fewer	19	16.2
6 to 10 years	8	6.8
11 to 15 years	25	21.4
16 to 20 years	11	9.4
More than 20 years	52	44.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	15	12.8
Criminal	21	17.9
Mixed criminal & civil	30	25.6
Civil	45	38.5
Other	6	5.1
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	53	45.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	59	50.4
Fourth District	4	3.4
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	2	1.7
Male	52	44.4
Female	63	53.8
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
Chris Peloso
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	117	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	81	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.6
Experience within last 5 years	69	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.3	2.7	2.7
Experience not within last 5 years	12	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.3
Substantial amount of experience	19	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.4
Moderate amount of experience	29	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.5
Limited amount of experience	33	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.9	2.8
Professional reputation	33	2.7	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.7	2.6
Other personal contacts	3	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	2.7	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.2	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.4
Government	37	2.8	3.1	3.6	3.3	2.8	2.7
Public service agency or organization	5	2.6	1.8	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.8
Retired	3	4.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.7	3.7
Other	1	2.0	3.0	3.0		2.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	12	2.8	3.3	3.7	3.5	2.9	2.9
6 to 10 years	8	2.9	3.5	3.8	3.3	2.6	2.5
11 to 15 years	19	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.6
16 to 20 years	7	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.1	3.1
More than 20 years	33	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.5	2.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	2.2	3.0	3.6	3.2	2.4	2.4
Criminal	13	2.5	3.2	3.2	3.3	2.3	2.5
Mixed criminal & civil	27	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.1	2.9
Civil	27	2.7	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.5
Other	4	2.8	2.3	2.8	2.0	2.7	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	39	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.2	2.8	2.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	37	2.6	3.1	3.3	3.1	2.6	2.5
Fourth District	4	2.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.3	2.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	35	3.1	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.1
Female	44	2.4	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.5	2.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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