

**Twenty-Third Report: 2005-2006
to the
Legislature and Supreme Court**

January 2007

The Alaska Judicial Council (2005-2006)

Members and Terms

Chairperson

Chief Justice Dana Fabe (2006-2009)
Chief Justice Alexander O. Bryner (2003-2006)

Attorney Members

Douglas Baily (2004-2010)
James H. Cannon (2006-2012)
Robert B. Groseclose (2000-2006)
Susan Orlansky (2002-2008)

Non-Attorney Members

Eleanor Andrews (2000-2007)
Bill Gordon (2003-2009)
Gigi Pilcher (2000-2005)
Christena Williams (2005-2011)

Council Staff

Larry Cohn, Executive Director
Teresa W. Carns, Senior Staff Associate
Susie Mason Dosik, Project Coordinator
E.J. Pavsek, Fiscal Officer
Susan McKelvie, Research Analyst
Emily R. Marrs, Executive Secretary
Kathy Grabowski, Selection and Retention Assistant

Deliberately left blank



Judicial Council Membership 2006

Members and staff, left to right (standing)

Susan Orlansky, Chief Justice Dana Fabe, Eleanor Andrews, Bill Gordon, James Cannon

(seated)

Teresa W. Carns (Senior Staff Associate), Christena Williams, Douglas Baily,

Larry Cohn (Executive Director)

Deliberately left blank

Table of Contents

	Page
Part I: Introduction	
A. Judicial Council Duties	1
B. Council Membership	2
C. Organization and Administration of the Council	2
Part II: Judicial Selection and Evaluation 2003-2004	
A. Judicial Selection	5
1. Nominations	5
2. Selection Procedures	6
B. Evaluation of Judges	6
1. Retention Election Evaluations	6
2. Performance Evaluation of <i>Pro Tem</i> Judges and Other Judicial Officers	7
Part III: Reports and Recommendations	
A. Introduction	13
1. <i>Evaluation of Three Therapeutic Courts</i> (April 2005)	13
2. <i>Court Innovations in Domestic Violence Cases: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary</i> (August 2005)	13
3. <i>Therapeutic Justice Statewide Database</i> (September 2006)	14
Part IV - Current Judicial Council Projects	
A. Council Projects	17
1. Recidivism Report	17
2. Therapeutic Justice Evaluation Follow-up	17
3. Wellness Court Evaluation	18
4. Civil Case Data	18
5. Report on New Sentencing Legislation	18
B. Commissions, Boards and Committee Service	18
1. Supreme Court Fairness and Access Implementation Committee	18
2. Judicial Education Committees	19
3. MAJIC Committee	19
4. Other Interagency Work	19

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendices

	Page
Appendix A - Catalogue of Current Law Relating to the Alaska Judicial Council	A-1
Appendix B - Judicial Council Membership	B-1
Appendix C - Bylaws of the Alaska Judicial Council	C-1
Appendix D - Judicial Selection Procedures	D-1
Appendix E - Judicial Appointment Log	E-1
Appendix F - Retention Evaluation Procedures	F-1
Appendix G - Retention Election History for Judges Currently Serving on the Bench	G-1
Appendix H - Summary of Programs and Recommendations of the Council Since Statehood: 1959-2006	H-1
Appendix I - Council Publications Since Statehood	I-1

Part I
Introduction

Deliberately left blank

Part I

Introduction

Alaska's Constitution established the Alaska Judicial Council and required it to "make reports and recommendations to the supreme court and to the legislature at intervals of not more than two years" (Article IV, Section 9). This twenty-third report to the legislature and the supreme court summarizes the Council's activities in 2005 and 2006 in judicial selection and evaluation, and in research. Appendices to the report describe the Council's membership (Appendix B), bylaws (Appendix C), judicial selection procedures (Appendix D), judicial nominations and appointments since statehood (Appendix E), retention election evaluation procedures and a 2006 retention vote analysis (Appendix F), a retention election history for judges currently serving on the bench (Appendix G), a list of major Council recommendations since statehood (Appendix H), and a list of the Council's reports since statehood (Appendix I).

A. Judicial Council Duties

The Judicial Council has constitutional and statutory duties in three general areas. First, the Council screens applicants for judicial vacancies and nominates the most qualified applicants to the governor for appointment. The legislature also has assigned to the Council the responsibility of screening applicants for the head of the Public Defender Agency.

Second, the Council by law must evaluate the performance of judges who are to appear on the ballot, and must make performance information and recommendations available to voters. The supreme court has asked the Council to conduct similar evaluations of retired judges sitting *pro tem*, and of masters and magistrates.

Third, the Alaska Constitution directs the Judicial Council to conduct studies and make recommendations to improve the administration of justice in Alaska. The legislature has assigned the Council specific projects from time to time such as the collection of civil case data, and the evaluation of therapeutic courts. The Alaska Supreme Court and/or the Alaska Court System have requested the Council to conduct other projects such as the Council's evaluation of disparities in Alaska's felony process and its evaluation of changes in the processing of domestic violence cases. Appendix A gives constitutional and statutory references to all mandated Judicial Council functions.

B. Council Membership

Article IV, Section 8 of Alaska's Constitution establishes the membership of the Council as three non-attorney members appointed by the Governor, three attorney members appointed by the Board of Governors of the Alaska Bar Association, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alaska who serves, *ex officio*, as Chairperson. The Constitution provides that all appointments shall be made "with due consideration to area representation and without regard to political affiliation." A majority of both houses of the legislature must confirm the non-attorney appointments, while the Board of Governors of the Alaska Bar Association appoints the attorney members after conducting advisory elections among Bar members within local judicial districts. Members serve six-year staggered terms.

Since the last report, two new members have joined the Council. Governor Murkowski appointed Christena Williams of Ketchikan to replace Gigi Pilcher as a non-attorney member. The Alaska Bar Association Board of Governors named James Cannon of Fairbanks to replace attorney Robert Groseclose. Appendix B lists all Council members since statehood.

C. Organization and Administration of the Council

The Judicial Council is governed by bylaws adopted in concurrence with the constitutional provision that the Council shall act ". . . according to rules which it adopts" (Article IV, Section 8). The Council revised its bylaws since its last report. The current bylaws are in Appendix C and on the Council's website at www.ajc.state.ak.us.

The legislature funds most Council activities from the general fund. The Council received funds in 2005 and 2006 from the Alaska Court System and the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services to carry out some of its projects. The Council also received National Institute of Justice funding through the University of Alaska Anchorage.

The Judicial Council's staff currently includes the executive director, senior staff associate, project coordinator, fiscal officer, research analyst, selection and retention assistant, and executive secretary. Additional temporary staff work as needed.

Part II
Judicial Selection and Evaluation

Deliberately left blank

Part II

Judicial Selection and Evaluation

2005-2006

A. Judicial Selection

1. Nominations

The Council nominated applicants for eight superior court vacancies in 2005 and 2006. Judge Richard D. Savell retired from the Fairbanks Superior Court. On April 20, 2005, Governor Frank Murkowski appointed Robert B. Downes to replace him. Two vacancies were created on the Anchorage Superior Court by the retirements of Judges Dan A. Hensley and Larry D. Card. On November 30, 2005, Governor Murkowski appointed Eric A. Aarseth and Patrick J. McKay to the positions. Judge Charles R. Pengilly retired from the Fairbanks Superior Court. On March 10, 2006, Governor Murkowski appointed Douglas L. Blankenship to the position. The legislature created two new superior court positions in Anchorage and two new superior court positions in Palmer. On November 17, 2006, Governor Murkowski appointed Anchorage District Court Judge Jack W. Smith and Michael Spaan to the Anchorage positions and Kari Kristiansen and Vanessa H. White to the Palmer positions.

The Council nominated applicants for three district court vacancies in 2005 and 2006. A vacancy was created by the passing away of Anchorage District Court Judge Samuel Adams. Governor Murkowski appointed Alex M. Swiderski to the position on April 11, 2005. Judge M. Francis Neville retired from the Homer District Court. On April 20, 2005, Governor Murkowski appointed Margaret L. Murphy to replace her. The legislature created a new district court position in Bethel. On November 30, 2005, Governor Murkowski appointed Dennis P. Cummings.

The Council also reviewed applicants for a superior court vacancy in Bethel that occurred due to the retirement of Judge Dale O. Curda. The Council met in October 2005 but was unable to forward the names of two or more qualified applicants. The Council will be meeting in January 2007 to interview applicants for the position.

In addition to the reviewing applicants for these judgeships, the Council reviewed applicants for the position of Alaska Public Defender. A vacancy occurred when Barbara K. Brink's most recent term expired. On October 14, 2005, Governor Murkowski appointed Quinlan Steiner.

In recent years, judicial vacancies have occurred at a much more rapid pace than the historical rate, because of judicial retirements and the creation of new positions by the legislature. The number of applicants per vacancy has also risen.

2. Selection Procedures

The Council uses the selection procedures that it has developed over the past three decades. The Council asks for character references and detailed reference letters and performance assessments by persons with direct, recent professional experience with the applicant, obtains feedback from the applicant's former employers, solicits comments from the public through its website and in public hearings conducted in the location of the vacancy, reviews information about professional discipline and credit and criminal histories, evaluates writing samples, and investigates issues that arise in any of the information. The Council interviews each applicant. Applicants may choose whether to have a public or private interview.

For each vacancy, the Council surveys every active and every in-state inactive member of the Alaska Bar Association. In 2004, the Council began using an electronic survey to supplement its paper survey. The availability of the electronic survey has resulted in an enhanced survey response rate and more information about applicants. About two-thirds of survey responses are electronic. The electronic survey is less costly for the Council to administer.

The survey asks respondents to rate attorneys based on their professional competence, integrity, fairness, judicial temperament, suitability of experience, and overall qualifications. Respondents may also submit comments. Comments are shared with applicants after the comments have been edited to preserve the anonymity of survey respondents. Council members do not consider unsigned comments unless the comments are substantiated, corroborated, or acknowledged by the applicant.

The Council periodically reviews its selection procedures to make improvements. Since its last report, the Council engaged in a comprehensive review of its selection procedures. It solicited suggestions from members of all branches of government, judges, attorneys, and members of the public as to how the process might be improved. Appendix D contains a very detailed description of the Council's updated selection procedures. Appendix E shows the history of judicial vacancies, with applicants, nominees and appointees.

B. Evaluation of Judges

1. Retention Election Evaluations

Alaska's constitution and statutes require each judge periodically to stand for retention at the general election. Term lengths vary with the judicial position, with all judges serving a shorter initial term, and longer terms after the first retention. Statutes passed in 1975 require the Judicial Council to evaluate each judge standing for retention, and to make the results of the evaluations known to the public. The Council also recommends a "yes" or "no" vote on each judge to the voters, and publicizes its decisions.

Thirty-one judges stood for retention in 2006 including eighteen superior court and thirteen district court judges. The high rate of judicial vacancies and the creation of several new judgeships in recent years contributed to the number of judges on the ballot in 2006.

The Council found thirty of the thirty-one judges qualified and recommended a "yes" vote for retention. Voters retained these thirty judges, with "yes" vote percentages ranging from 57% to 78%.

The Council recommended against the retention of Kenai District Court Judge David S. Landry. The public voted not to retain Judge Landry. The last time Alaskans voted not to retain a state court judge was in 1982 when two Anchorage District Court judges were not retained. (See more detailed analysis in Appendix F.)

The Judicial Council surveyed all active members of the Alaska Bar Association and inactive in-state members, and all peace and probation officers in the state. In 2006, the Council sent surveys to 3,036 attorneys (39.3% response rate) and 1,492 peace and probation officers (29.5% response rate). An independent contractor handled the surveys for the Judicial Council, to assure objectivity in the findings. Questions on the surveys asked about judges' legal abilities, fairness, integrity, temperament, diligence and overall performance. Similar surveys went to 347 social workers and citizens who participated in helping Alaska's children in court as guardians ad litem and Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers (27.7% response rate). The Council asked jurors who had served on cases with the judges to comment on the judges' abilities to handle the trials fairly and capably (2,623 responded). The Council also surveyed 606 non-attorney court employees (39% return rate). The Council used electronic surveys when it was feasible to do so.

Each judge standing for retention returned a self-evaluation questionnaire to the Judicial Council. The questionnaire included lists of recent cases that the judge believed were important for evaluation, with an emphasis on jury and non-jury trials. The Council asked each attorney in each

case to fill out an additional survey about the judge's performance in that particular case, including detailed comments about the judge's abilities.

Council staff reviewed a series of other public records, including conflict-of-interest annual statements filed with the Alaska Public Offices Commission and separate forms filed with the court system; court case files; Commission on Judicial Conduct public files; and a report on any withheld salary warrants. The Council also reviewed performance-related court data, such as the number of peremptory challenges filed against a judge, the number of times a judge recused himself or herself from presiding over a case, and how frequently the judge was reversed on appeal in civil and criminal cases. The Alaska Judicial Observers, an independent group of community-based volunteer court observers, provided ratings and observations about judges in Anchorage, Kenai and Palmer who they had evaluated.

The Council publicized the evaluation process throughout the state. The Council held statewide public hearings for all judges standing for retention, using the legislature's teleconference network and public meeting rooms. Statewide newspaper ads encouraged public participation. The Council solicited comments about judges on its website.

Council staff investigated specific cases, listened to court proceedings, and interviewed judges, attorneys, court staff, and others. Council members interviewed some judges.

The Council made its retention evaluation information widely available to the public. The Official Election Pamphlet sent to each Alaska voter included a page summarizing the Council's performance evaluation materials on each judge. The Council published comprehensive materials, and posted most non-confidential information on its Internet website (www.ajc.state.ak.us). In 2006, the Council placed a series of ads in most of the state newspapers during the weeks before the November election.

Appendices F and G contain detailed information about Alaska's judicial performance evaluation process. They include examples of the voter pamphlet pages and a log showing when each judge must stand or has stood for retention. Appendix F also analyzes retention election votes, and summarizes information about performance evaluations for each judge and justice who stood for retention between 1976 and 2006.

2. Performance Evaluation of Pro Tem Judges and Other Judicial Officers

The Council's role in evaluation expanded in 1986, when the supreme court adopted Administrative Rule 23, requiring the Council to evaluate retired judges who wish to serve pro tem. The rule requires the Council to survey Bar members, evaluate the judges' abilities to serve pro tem,

and provide the evaluations to the Chief Justice. The Council evaluated twelve retired judicial officers in 2006. The Council used a survey to evaluate nine of the retired judges and sent questionnaires to attorneys who had practiced before three retired judges who had served less often.

In 1997, the Alaska Supreme Court asked the Council to conduct an experimental survey on the performance of standing masters. Standing masters handle substantial numbers of child and family cases, domestic violence matters, and criminal arraignments and bail settings. The presiding judge of each judicial district appoints, supervises and disciplines these judicial officers.

In 1997-98, the Council sent a brief-format survey to all active members of the Alaska Bar Association, all Alaska peace and probation officers, and Anchorage-area social workers and guardians ad litem. In 1999 and in 2001, the Council surveyed attorneys and peace and probation officers concerning magistrates and masters in Alaska. Survey results were shared with the magistrates and masters to encourage improvement in performance, with the presiding judge who supervised the magistrates, and with the Alaska Supreme Court. The Council will conduct an evaluation of Alaska's masters and magistrates in 2007 using funding provided by the legislature for this purpose.

Deliberately left blank

Part III
Reports and Recommendations

Deliberately left blank

Part III

Reports and Recommendations

A. Introduction

Alaska's constitution requires the Judicial Council to "conduct studies for the improvement of the administration of justice, and make reports and recommendations to the supreme court and to the legislature." This section of the Twenty-Third Report summarizes the reports and recommendations completed in 2005 and 2006. Appendix H lists all major Council recommendations since statehood, and Appendix I lists all Council reports.

1. Evaluation of Three Therapeutic Courts (April 2005)

The Council evaluated Alaska's three therapeutic courts that served primarily felony offenders, the Anchorage Felony Drug Court, the Anchorage Felony Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Court, and the Bethel Therapeutic Court. Staff collected data about the defendants' personal characteristics, such as age, ethnicity, gender, types of problems, prior criminal history, and location in the state. The Council looked at changes in days of incarceration, numbers of remands, and numbers of convictions for each court. Defendants participating in the program improved on each of these measures, especially those who graduated from the programs. Conversely, the comparison defendants had significantly more days of incarceration during the two years after their target offense. Participants in the program also appeared to improve in education, employment and family stability while in the program. The legislature funded the evaluation through the Department of Health and Social Services.

2. Court Innovations in Domestic Violence Cases: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary (August 2005)

The Alaska Court System asked the Council to evaluate two innovative domestic violence projects funded for the Anchorage civil court by the federal government in 2002. The report includes data about the domestic violence civil process in Anchorage, and an analysis of changes in long term orders issued, and child support and custody issues dealt with in domestic violence cases. One of the most important findings was that civil and criminal domestic violence cases declined in the year after the new projects started. Both of the new projects provided new services to participants in civil domestic violence cases, and improved the existing services. Because of the short time available for

the evaluation, the Council suggested that the Court continue to assess the effectiveness of the projects over a longer period.

The Council did a brief separate report, *The Domestic Violence Index Evaluation*, that it published in September 2006. The computerized index pulls together domestic violence-related cases for Alaska Court System staff using the CourtView case management program. The Council surveyed and interviewed users of the pilot index, and found that the index could help court staff respond more quickly with needed information about parties in domestic violence cases. The index needed revisions, which were being made at the time of the evaluation. The Court System used federal monies to fund both evaluations.

3. Therapeutic Justice Statewide Database (September 2006)

The Council worked with therapeutic justice practitioners around the state, and with national experts to create a design for a statewide, web-based database for the court system. All of the therapeutic and problem-solving courts would use the database, and it would be available, with appropriate protections, to share data with other agencies. The report describes current data collection efforts, discusses possible barriers to data collection, considers the legal and confidentiality issues, and describes proposed data elements. It includes flowcharts for therapeutic justice processes, discusses incentives and sanctions, and briefly describes national guidelines for the therapeutic court databases. The court system funded this project.

Part IV
Current Judicial Council Work

Deliberately left blank

Part IV

Current Judicial Council Projects

Introduction

This part of the Twenty-Third Report describes the Council's current projects.

A. Council Projects

1. Recidivism Report

The Judicial Council, with funding from the Department of Health and Social Services, followed nearly two thousand offenders included in the Council's 2004 report, *ALASKA FELONY PROCESS: 1999*. These were offenders who were convicted after having felony charges filed against them in 1999. The recidivism report will review all of the offenders who were out of custody for at least three years after serving their sentence for the 1999 offense. Data will show how many were re-arrested, had new cases filed in court, were re-convicted, or were remanded to custody for any reason during the three years. Information about the offenders' ages, ethnicities, genders, prior criminal histories, economic status, and substance abuse or alcohol problems will be combined with information about their types of offenses. The analysis also will show how soon offenders recidivated after their release from the 1999 offense.

This report will be the first general study of recidivism in Alaska. Legislators, policy-makers and other will be able to use this information to help measure the effectiveness of policies, and to suggest new approaches to sanctioning offenders and protecting the public. The Council will publish the report in early 2007.

2. Therapeutic Justice Evaluation Follow-up

Using the same types of information and methods of analysis as the recidivism report for the 1999 offenders, the Council is looking at the recidivism data for the 258 offenders who were included in the April 2005 evaluation of felony therapeutic courts. The Council is comparing the recidivism of therapeutic court participants who have been out of the program for at least one year to the recidivism of comparison offenders who have finished serving any incarceration imposed for at least one year. This report also is expected to be completed in early 2007.

3. Wellness Court Evaluation

During 2007, the Council will complete its work on the long-term evaluation of the Anchorage Wellness Court. The National Institute of Justice funded the evaluation in 2003 for the Council, the University of Alaska Justice Center, and The Urban Institute. The Council is conducting interviews and a literature review, focused on the transferability of the Wellness Court model to other types of cases, and other courts. The other partners in the evaluation are looking at the empirical data about the results of the program, and the costs and benefits of the program. The report is expected to be published near the end of 2007.

4. Civil Case Data

The Council continues to collect data about the resolution of civil cases. The legislature required in 1997 that the Council compile this information and report on it periodically. The Council has issued two reports (available on its website under “Publications”).

5. Report on New Sentencing Legislation

In June 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its opinion in *Blakely v. Washington* (542 U.S. 296, 124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 L.Ed.2d 403 (2004)), changing sentencing procedures in a dozen states and the federal system, by requiring a jury trial on any factors that would increase a defendant’s sentence above the statutory maximum. Alaska was one of the states most affected by the ruling. The Council wrote a report on the effects of the Supreme Court decision on appeals. The report also described a new sentencing scheme adopted by the legislature in 2005. Council staff presented the report at the National Association of Sentencing Commissions meeting in 2005, and are presently updating the report for the Alaska Law Review to publish in 2007.

B. Commissions, Boards and Committee Service

The Judicial Council plays an important role in Alaska’s justice system by working with the courts, legislature and executive branch agencies on committees and shared interests. During 2005 and 2006, these groups included:

1. Supreme Court Fairness and Access Implementation Committee

The supreme court’s committee of justices and judges includes a Council staff person and the court system’s administrative director. The group has worked since 1998 to carry out the recommendations of the Fairness and Access Committee made in 1997. During 2005 and 2006, the Implementation Committee considered its work to date, and agreed to make an interim report to the public in 2007. The Council continues to contribute to the committee’s work, particularly in the areas of justice system disproportions and disparities.

2. Judicial Education Committees

Council staff serves on two of the court's committees for planning judicial training and education. The Executive Director is a member of the committee for training new judges, which will hold its second new-judge training conference in January of 2007. The Senior Staff Associate continues to serve on the committee for planning the spring and fall judicial conferences for all judges. Council participation on these committees gives other members the benefit of the Council's perspective on judicial needs gained from the selection and evaluation processes.

3. MAJIC Committee

Council staff serves on the steering committee for the Multi-Agency Justice Integration Consortium (MAJIC). The group was formed in 2002 by the statutory Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board whose mission is to help agencies share information to improve performance of the criminal justice system as a whole. The eighteen agencies on the steering committee meet biweekly to resolve problems, test approaches to information sharing, and find ways to standardize data.

4. Other Interagency Work

State and national organizations invite the Council to participate in work groups, task forces, planning committees and other organizations because of the Council's experience in various fields. In 2005 and 2006, Council staff presented a paper at the National Association of Sentencing Commissions, participated in a nationally-funded drug court database working group, were invited to work with a committee on training judges in self-represented litigant issues, and participated on a Rural Justice Commission working group that drafted a memorandum of agreement for the state and tribes in Indian Child Welfare cases. Staff have also worked with national organizations interested in promoting merit selection and in understanding judicial performance evaluations and retention elections.

Deliberately left blank

Appendix A

**Catalogue of Current Law
Relating to the Alaska Judicial Council**

Deliberately left blank

Appendix A

Catalogue of Current Law Relating to the Alaska Judicial Council

Alaska Constitution

ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4	Qualifications of justices and judges.
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 5	Duty to nominate supreme court justices and superior court judges .
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 6	Retention.
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 7	Judicial vacancy.
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 8	Composition of Judicial Council and manner of appointment of members; necessity of four votes.
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 9	Duty to conduct studies to improve the administration of justice; biennial report.
ARTICLE IV, SECTION 13	Compensation of Judicial Council members to be prescribed by law.
ARTICLE XV, SECTION 16	First Judicial Council.

Alaska Statutes

01.10.055	Residency requirements for judicial applicants.
09.68.130	Judicial Council to collect and evaluate information relating to compromise or other resolution of all civil litigation.
12.62.100	Representative of Judicial Council to serve on Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board (CJIAB advises criminal justice agencies on criminal justice information systems and central repository).
15.13.010	Judges to file retention reports with APOC. (See AS 15.13 generally for detailed APOC requirements).
15.13.040	Requirement to report election advertising and other expenditures made for or against any candidate.
15.15.030(10)	Election ballot for judicial retention.
15.15.450	Certification of retention vote.
15.35.030	Approval/rejection of supreme court justice.
15.35.040	Retention filing deadline for supreme court.
15.35.053	Approval/rejection of court of appeals judge.
15.35.055	Retention filing deadline for court of appeals.
15.35.060	Approval/rejection of superior court judge.
15.35.070	Retention filing deadline for superior court.
15.35.080	Determination of judicial district in which superior court judge to seek approval.
15.35.100	Approval/rejection of district court judge.
15.35.110	Retention filing deadline for district court.
15.58.020(2)	Election pamphlet must contain retention election information from Judicial Council.
15.58.030(g)	August 7 deadline for judges to file photograph and statement for election pamphlet.
15.58.050	August 7 deadline for Judicial Council to file informational statements regarding justices and judges for election pamphlet. Statements must reflect evaluations and must describe each public reprimand, public censure or suspension received during the evaluation period by a justice or judge standing for retention. Six hundred word limit.

15.58.060 (c)	Judicial Council does not have to pay for space in election pamphlet.
18.85.030 and .050	Duty of Judicial Council to nominate public defender candidates. Candidates to be nominated as soon as possible if vacancy occurs mid-term.
21.06.087	Division of Insurance may consult with Judicial Council in determining the information insurers must report regarding the effect of "tort reform" laws on the availability and cost of insurance in Alaska.
22.05.020	Composition of supreme court.
22.05.070	Qualifications of supreme court justices.
22.05.080	Judicial Council to nominate supreme court justice candidates; vacancy occurs 90 days after election at which rejected or for which judge failed to file for retention.
22.05.100	Judicial Council to evaluate supreme court justices eligible for retention, and provide information and any recommendation to public.
22.05.130	Restrictions on supreme court justices.
22.07.010	Composition of court of appeals.
22.07.040	Qualifications of court of appeals judges.
22.07.060	Judicial Council to evaluate court of appeals judges eligible for retention, and provide information and any recommendation to public.
22.07.070	Duty to nominate court of appeals judge candidates; vacancy occurs 90 days after election at which rejected or for which judge failed to file for retention.
22.07.080	Restrictions on court of appeals judges.
22.10.010	Judicial districts established.
22.10.090	Qualifications of superior court judges.
22.10.100	Duty to nominate superior court candidates; vacancy occurs 90 days after election at which rejected or for which judge failed to file for retention.
22.10.120	Composition of superior court; Judicial Council to designate judicial district in which appointee to reside and serve.
22.10.150	Judicial Council to evaluate superior court judges eligible for retention, and provide information and any recommendation to public.
22.10.180	Restrictions on superior court judges.
22.15.020	Composition of district court.
22.15.160	Qualifications of district court judges.
22.15.170	Duty to nominate district court judge candidates; vacancy occurs 90 days after election at which rejected or for which judge failed to file for retention. Presiding judge may appoint acting district court judges.
22.15.195	Judicial Council to evaluate district court judges eligible for retention, and provide information and any recommendation to public.
22.15.210	Restrictions on district court judges.
22.20.037	Judicial Council employees subject to state laws regarding leave, retirement, travel; annual salary survey.
22.20.200	Judicial Council to periodically review and distribute information about legal use of DNA profiles to selected agencies.
22.25.010(b)	Copy of declaration of judicial retirement for incapacity to be filed with Judicial Council.
22.30.010	Judicial Council members may not serve simultaneously on Commission on Judicial Conduct.
22.30.011	Commission on Judicial Conduct to report to Judicial Council all public sanctions imposed on justices and judges standing for retention.
22.30.070©	Copy of notice of judicial retirement for disability to be filed with Judicial Council.
24.55.100 & .330	Judicial Council subject to jurisdiction of Ombudsman.
39.05.035	Commission of office.
39.05.045	Oath of office.
39.05.070	Uniformity of appointment process.
39.05.080	Appointment procedure.

39.05.100	Qualifications for appointment to Judicial Council.
39.20.170-.185	Travel and per diem reimbursement for Judicial Council members; no per diem for business in home community.
39.25.110(2) and (10)	Justices, judges, Judicial Council members and staff exempt from coverage of State Personnel Act.
39.50.010-.090, .135, .200	Council members to file reports of financial and business interests with APOC. Procedures and consequences detailed.
40.25.110-120; 39.90.010	Inspection and copying of public records; compliance not to be penalized.
44.62.175	Council meetings to be noticed on Alaska Online Public Notice System.
44.62.310	Council meetings open to the public; notice required; teleconference and executive session procedures.
44.62.312	State policy regarding meetings.
44.99.200-.240	Production of publications; disclosure statement required.

Rules of Court

Civil R. 41(a)	Parties to voluntarily dismissed actions to report information to Judicial Council; certification required.
App. R. 511(c) and (e)	Parties to dismissed civil appeals required to report information to Judicial Council; certification required.
Alaska Bar R. 21(c)(5)	Judicial Council access to confidential information maintained by Bar Counsel regarding applicants for judicial vacancies.
Judicial Conduct Canon 5	Political activities allowed and prohibited for judges and for candidates for judicial office.
Adm. R. 23(c)	<i>Pro tem</i> judge performance evaluation by Council.

Administrative Code

2 AAC 37.010	Judicial retirement for incapacity.
--------------	-------------------------------------

State Admin. Regulations

(State Administrative Manual)

AAM 60.010-60.400	Travel and moving.
-------------------	--------------------

Alaska Attorney General Opinions

#663 -87 -0258 (12/12/1986)	Executive Ethics Act (AS 39.52) does not apply to Judicial Council.
#366 -308 -85 (1/16/1985)	Sitting state legislator may apply for an existing judicial position, but would be ineligible for appointment if the legislature were to increase the benefits of the judicial office before the date of the appointment.
#366 -625 -84 (supp) (10/9/1984)	Judicial Council is a public agency subject to general state law, including the public meetings statute (AS 44.62.310). Judicial Council may discuss judicial applicants' qualifications in executive session, with the discussions and deliberations kept confidential.
#366-625-84 (10/3/1984)	Judicial Council is subject to state public records statutes; Council may adopt rules and regulations regarding the confidentiality of its records, consistent with those statutes. Judicial Council must consider constitutional right to privacy and deliberation process in deciding if particular records are confidential. Judicial Council does not have subpoena power to compel testimony or the production of records. Submission to the governor of confidential contents of Council records or files, including confidential reference letters, is within the discretion of the Council. Confidential letters transferred to the governor remain confidential. (See also, #366 -350- 84 (1/5/1984), regarding governor's release to a Council member of portions of reference letter referring to that Council member).
#366-624-84 (7/19/1984)	Residence and practice of law requirements for district court judge candidates.

#366-357-83 (12/3/1982)	Five year statutory residency requirement for justices and judges is constitutionally sound.
#366-781-82 (10/25/1982), #A66-423-82 (4/1/1982)and #J66-532-81 (3/9/1981)	AS 39.20.185, disallowing per diem “when the meeting or other business takes place in the community of which the member is a resident,” applies only to a Council member who is otherwise employed by, or is an officer of, the state (i.e., the Chief Justice).
#J66-463-81 (1/12/1981)	Governor may appoint an acting public defender to fill vacancy, pending a permanent appointment. Judicial Council and governor to fill public defender vacancy as soon as possible.
#J66-417-80 (1/28/1980)	Judicial Council may contract with state agency to evaluate agency program relating to the administration of justice. The scope of the studies and reports that may be undertaken by the Judicial Council is limited in practicality solely by the sound discretion of the Council.
#xxx-680-xx (11/8/1968)	Judicial Council may submit more than two names to governor for each judicial vacancy to be filled. Governor is bound to fill judicial vacancy from list of nominees submitted by Judicial Council.

Past Statutes, Temporary and Special Acts, and Resolutions

Ch. 108, Sec. 1 (1996) <i>(repealed effective 7/1/05)</i>	Duty of Council to evaluate and nominate administrative law judge candidates; duty of Council to evaluate administrative law judge who seeks reappointment; duty to recommend to governor whether administrative law judge should be reappointed.
Ch. 73 (1990)	Authorizing the Alaska Sentencing Commission to place staff under the executive director of the Judicial Council.
H. Conc. Res. 5am S (1979)	Request for Council to expand statistical sentencing research to address inequities in sentencing ethnic minority offenders.
S. Res. 5am (8/16/1985)	Council to study grand jury.
Ch. 163 (1990)	Requiring the Judicial Council to establish and evaluate a pilot child visitation mediation project.
Ch. 026, Sec. 54 (1997)	Requiring the Judicial Council to report to the legislature regarding establishment of a program for alternative dispute resolution in the Alaska Court System.
Ch. 64, Sec.1(k)(2001)	Requiring the Judicial Council to develop a uniform data collection form for use by the therapeutic courts and to evaluate and report on the effectiveness of the pilot therapeutic court programs.

Appendix B
Judicial Council Membership

Deliberately left blank

Appendix B

Judicial Council Membership

Members of the Alaska Judicial Council		
Council Members	Appointment Effective	Expiration Date
Chief Justice Dana Fabe Alaska Supreme Court 303 K Street Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2084	7/1/06	6/30/09
Douglas Baily (<i>Attorney Member</i>) 617 W. Willoughby #123 Juneau, AK 99701-4470	4/27/04	2/23/10
James H. Cannon (<i>Attorney Member</i>) P.O. Box 70891 Fairbanks, AK 99707	2/23/06	2/23/12
Susan Orlansky (<i>Attorney Member</i>) Feldman & Orlansky 500 L Street, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501-5911	3/14/02	2/23/08
Eleanor Andrews (<i>Non-Attorney Member</i>) 2627 C Street Anchorage, AK 99503	11/15/00	3/1/07
Bill Gordon (<i>Non-Attorney Member</i>) 3205 Riverview Rd. Fairbanks, AK 99709	5/18/03	3/1/09
Christena Williams (<i>Non-Attorney Member</i>) 501 Dock Street Ketchikan, AK 99901	3/21/00	3/1/11

Judicial Council attorney and non-attorney members serve terms of six years. The Chief Justice serves a three-year term.

Historical Roster of Alaska Judicial Council Members			
	Residence	Appointment Effective	Expiration of Term
Chairperson¹			
Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett		11/29/59	06/18/70
Chief Justice George F. Boney		06/18/70	11/16/72
Chief Justice Jay A. Rabinowitz		11/16/72	11/16/75
Chief Justice Robert Boochever		11/16/75	11/16/78
Chief Justice Jay A. Rabinowitz		11/16/78	11/16/81
Chief Justice Edmond W. Burke		11/16/81	09/30/84
Chief Justice Jay A. Rabinowitz		10/01/84	09/30/87
Chief Justice Warren W. Matthews		10/01/87	09/30/90
Chief Justice Jay A. Rabinowitz ³		10/01/90	09/30/92
Chief Justice Daniel A. Moore, Jr.		10/01/92	09/30/95
Chief Justice Allen T. Compton ³		10/01/95	07/01/97
Chief Justice Warren W. Matthews		07/02/97	06/30/00
Chief Justice Dana Fabe		07/01/00	06/30/03
Chief Justice Alexander O. Bryner		07/01/03	06/30/06
Chief Justice Dana Fabe		07/01/06	06/30/09
Attorney Members			
E.E. Bailey ²	Ketchikan	02/24/59	02/24/62
E.E. Bailey	Ketchikan	02/24/62	02/24/68
Frank M. Doogan ³	Juneau	10/15/68	04/73
Michael L. Holmes ⁴	Juneau	05/73	02/24/74
Michael L. Holmes	Juneau	02/24/74	02/24/80
Walter L. Carpeneti ⁵	Juneau	02/24/80	02/81
James B. Bradley ⁴	Juneau	04/81	02/24/86
William T. Council	Juneau	02/24/86	02/24/92
Thomas G. Nave	Juneau	02/24/92	02/23/98
Geoffrey G. Currall	Ketchikan	02/24/98	02/23/04
Douglas Baily	Juneau	04/27/04	02/23/10
Robert A. Parrish ²	Fairbanks	02/24/59	02/24/64
William V. Boggess ⁵	Fairbanks	02/24/64	04/64
Michael Stepovich ⁴	Fairbanks	05/64	02/24/70
Michael Stepovich	Fairbanks	02/24/70	02/24/76
Michael Stepovich ³	Fairbanks	02/24/76	08/78
Marcus R. Clapp ⁴	Fairbanks	08/78	02/24/82
Mary E. Greene ³	Fairbanks	02/24/82	04/82
Barbara L. Schuhmann ⁴	Fairbanks	07/82	02/24/88
Daniel L. Callahan	Fairbanks	02/24/88	02/24/94
Christopher E. Zimmerman ⁵	Fairbanks	04/14/94	07/17/97
Paul J. Ewers	Fairbanks	07/18/97	02/23/00
Robert B. Groseclose	Fairbanks	04/05/00	02/23/06
James H. Cannon	Fairbanks	02/23/06	02/23/12

Historical Roster of Alaska Judicial Council Members			
	Residence	Appointment Effective	Expiration of Term
Attorney Members (Continued)			
Raymond E. Plummer ^{2, 3}	Anchorage	02/24/59	09/26/61
Harold Butcher ⁴	Anchorage	11/61	02/24/66
George F. Boney ⁵	Anchorage	02/24/66	09/68
Lester W. Miller, Jr. ⁴	Anchorage	10/15/68	02/24/72
Eugene F. Wiles ³	Anchorage	02/24/72	03/75
Joseph L. Young ⁴	Anchorage	04/75	02/24/78
Joseph L. Young	Anchorage	02/24/78	02/24/84
James D. Gilmore	Anchorage	02/24/84	02/24/90
Mark E. Ashburn	Anchorage	03/23/90	02/23/96
Robert H. Wagstaff	Anchorage	03/22/96	02/23/02
Susan Orlansky	Anchorage	3/14/02	02/23/08
Non-Attorney Members			
Elmo LeRoy "Roy" J. Walker ²	Fairbanks	05/18/59	05/18/61
John Cross	Kotzebue	05/18/61	05/18/67
Thomas K. Downes ³	Fairbanks	05/18/67	Mid-1968
V. Paul Gavora ⁴	Fairbanks	10/15/68	05/18/73
Thomas J. Miklautsch ³	Fairbanks	05/28/73	12/10/74
Robert H. Moss ⁴	Homer	12/10/74	05/18/79
Robert H. Moss	Homer	05/18/79	05/18/85
Dr. Hilbert J. Henrickson	Ketchikan	08/13/85	05/18/91
David A. Dapcevich	Sitka	05/19/91	05/18/97
Mary Matthews ³	Fairbanks	05/19/97	08/23/98
Sandra Stringer ⁴	Fairbanks	08/24/98	07/12/99
Katie Hurley	Wasilla	07/13/99	05/18/03
Bill Gordon	Fairbanks	05/18/03	03/01/09
Jack E. Werner ²	Seward	05/18/59	05/18/63
Jack E. Werner	Seward	05/18/63	05/18/69
Ken Brady	Anchorage	06/28/69	05/18/75
Ken Brady	Anchorage	05/18/75	05/18/81
Mary Jane Fate	Fairbanks	05/18/81	05/18/87
Leona Okakok	Barrow	07/31/87	05/18/93
Janice Lienhart	Anchorage	05/19/93	05/18/99
Gigi Pilcher	Ketchikan	03/21/00	05/18/05
Christena Williams	Ketchikan	03/11/05	03/01/11

Historical Roster of Alaska Judicial Council Members			
	Residence	Appointment Effective	Expiration of Term
Non-Attorney Members <i>(continued)</i>			
Dr. William M. Whitehead ^{2, 3}	Juneau	05/18/59	12/06/62
Charles W. Kidd ^{4, 3}	Juneau	04/63	01/64
H. Douglas Gray ⁴	Juneau	04/64	05/18/65
H.O. Smith ⁶	Ketchikan	05/18/65	06/65
Pete Meland ⁴	Sitka	01/66	05/18/71
Oral Freeman ³	Ketchikan	11/22/71	01/73
Lew M. Williams, Jr. ⁴	Ketchikan	04/73	05/18/77
John Longworth	Petersburg	05/18/77	05/18/83
Renee Murray	Anchorage	08/08/83	05/18/89
Janis Roller ³	Anchorage	09/01/89	02/14/91
Dr. Paul Dittrich, M.D. ^{4, 3}	Anchorage	04/06/91	10/03/91
Jim A. Arnesen ⁴	Anchorage	10/04/91	05/18/95
Vicki A. Otte ³	Juneau	05/31/95	11/21/00
Eleanor Andrews ⁴	Anchorage	11/15/00	05/18/01
Eleanor Andrews	Anchorage	05/18/01	03/01/07

¹ The Judicial Council initially submitted nominations for the position of Chief Justice; the Constitution did not limit the Chief Justice's term. Chief Justice Nesbett and Chief Justice Boney were nominated and appointed in this manner. Voters amended the Constitution on August 25, 1970 to provide for the election of the Chief Justice by the justices of the Supreme Court for a three-year term; the amendment further provided that a Chief Justice may not be re-elected to consecutive terms.

² Appointed to initial staggered term.

³ Resigned during term.

⁴ Appointed to complete unexpired term.

⁵ Resigned during term to apply for judicial office.

⁶ Denied legislative confirmation.

Appendix C

Bylaws of the Alaska Judicial Council

Deliberately left blank

Appendix C

Bylaws of the Alaska Judicial Council

ARTICLE I

Policies

Section 1. *Concerning Selection of Justices, Judges, and Public Defender.*

The Judicial Council shall endeavor to nominate for judicial office and for public defender those judges and members of the bar who stand out as most qualified based upon the council's consideration of their: professional competence, including written and oral communication skills; integrity; fairness; temperament; judgment, including common sense; legal and life experience; and demonstrated commitment to public and community service. The Council shall actively encourage qualified members of the bar to seek nomination to such offices, shall endeavor to prevent political considerations from outweighing fitness in the judicial and public defender nomination processes, and shall consistently strive to inform the public of Alaska's Judicial Council selection process.

Section 2. *Concerning Retention of Judges.*

Pursuant to the provisions of Alaska Statutes Titles 15 and 22, the Council may recommend the retention in judicial office of incumbent justices and judges found to be qualified through appropriate means of judicial performance assessment; and may recommend against retention of justices and judges found to be not qualified through assessment processes. The Council shall endeavor to prevent political considerations from outweighing fitness in the judicial retention recommendation process.

Section 3. *Concerning Administration of Justice*

The Council shall initiate studies and investigations for the improvement of the administration of justice. These studies and investigations may be conducted by the entire Council, by any of its members or by its staff as directed by the Council. The Council may hire researchers and investigators and may contract for the performance of these functions. A topic for any study or investigation may be proposed at any meeting of the Council by any member without prior notice.

ARTICLE II

Membership

Section 1. *Appointment; Limitation of Term.*

Members of the Council shall be appointed and shall serve their terms as provided by law; however, a member whose term has expired shall continue to serve until a successor has been appointed. Council members may be appointed to successive terms; however, no Council member should serve more than two full terms or one unexpired term and one full term.

Section 2. Effective Date of Appointment.

(A) Non-Attorney Members. The effective date of a non-attorney member's appointment to the Council shall be the day following the effective date of the vacancy in the seat to which appointed, if appointed before that date; or the date of or specified in the gubernatorial letter of appointment, if appointed after that date. Non-attorney members shall have full voting rights effective upon the appointment date, unless and until denied confirmation by the legislature.

(B) Attorney Members. The effective date of an attorney member's appointment shall be the day following the effective date of the vacancy in the seat to which appointed, if appointed before that date; or the date of or specified in the letter of appointment from the board of governors of the Alaska Bar Association, if appointed after that date.

(C) Chief Justice. The effective date of the chief justice's appointment is the date that the chief justice assumes the post of chief justice.

Section 3. Oath of Office.

The Chair of the Council shall administer the oath of office to each new member, following a determination by the Council that the person selected has met the qualifications for membership set forth by law.

Section 4. Vacancies.

At least 90 days prior to the expiration of the term of any Council member, or as soon as practicable following the death, resignation, or announced intent to resign of any Council member, the executive director shall notify the appropriate appointing authority and request that the appointment process be initiated immediately to fill the vacancy.

Section 5. Disqualification.

(A) Candidacy of Council Member. Any member of the Judicial Council who seeks appointment to a judicial office or the office of public defender must resign from the Council as of the date of the application and should not accept reappointment to the Council for a period of two years thereafter.

(B) Attendance at Regular Meetings. Council members shall attend all regular meetings of the Council unless excused by the chair for good cause. If a member is absent without good cause for two consecutive meetings, the chair shall formally request the resignation of that member.

Section 6. Expenses; Compensation.

Council members shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses incurred while on Council business and may receive compensation as otherwise provided by law.

ARTICLE III Officers

Section 1. Officers Specified.

- (A) The officers of the Council shall be the chair, vice-chair and executive director.
- (B) Chair. The chief justice of the Alaska Supreme Court is the chair of the Alaska Judicial Council.
- (C) Vice-Chair. The vice-chair will be the member of the Judicial Council whose current term will first expire.
- (D) Executive Director. The Council by concurrence of four or more of its members may designate an executive director to serve at the pleasure of the Council.

Section 2. Duties and Powers.

- (A) Chair. The chair shall preside at all meetings of the Council and perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Council. In the absence of an executive director or acting director, the chair will serve as acting director.
- (B) Vice-Chair. The vice-chair shall preside at meetings of the Council in the absence of the chair. The vice-chair shall perform such other duties as usually pertain to the office of the chair when the chair is unavailable to perform such functions.
- (C) Executive Director. The executive director shall keep a record of all meetings of the Council; shall serve as chief executive officer of the Council; shall be responsible to the Council for planning, supervising and coordinating all administrative, fiscal and programmatic activities of the Council; and shall perform such other duties as may be assigned. The executive director may receive compensation as prescribed by the Council and allowed by law.
- (D) Acting Director. In the event of the incapacity, disability, termination or death of the executive director, the Council may appoint an acting director, and may impose such limits on the authority of said acting director as it deems advisable, until such time as a new executive director can be found, or until such time as the incapacity of the executive director can be cured. Should the Council choose not to appoint an acting director or otherwise fail to appoint, the chair of the Council will, ex officio, serve as acting director until a replacement executive director can be found.

ARTICLE IV Meetings

Section 1. Public Sessions; Public Notice.

All meetings of the Judicial Council shall be open to the public, except as hereinafter specifically provided. At least three days prior to any such meeting to be held in Anchorage, Fairbanks, or Juneau, public notice of date, time, and place of the meeting and of general topics to be considered shall be given through paid advertisements in major newspapers of general circulation in all three cities; for meetings to be held elsewhere in the state, paid public notice shall be provided at least three days in advance in the newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in such other areas as well as in the newspapers of general circulation in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau. When the notice requirements of this section are determined by the Council to be unreasonable, the Council is authorized to meet after such other period and utilizing such other form of public notice as it deems reasonable under the circumstances.

Section 2. Participation by Telecommunications.

It shall be the policy of the Judicial Council to meet in person, where practicable. When, however, in the opinion of the chairperson, circumstances exist warranting a telephone conference among members between meetings, or the personal attendance of one or more Council members at a regularly scheduled meeting has been excused for good cause, a member or members may participate in regular or special meetings by teleconference subject to the following requirements: that reasonable public notice under Article IV, Section 1, and adequate notice to members under Article IV, Section 8, have been given; that at least one member or staff person is present at the time and location publicly announced for any such meeting; and that adequate teleconference or other electronic communication means are available. Teleconferencing may be used to establish quorums, receive public input and, if all voting individuals have a substantially equal opportunity to evaluate all testimony and evidence, to vote on actions.

Section 3. Regular Meetings.

The Council shall hold not fewer than two meetings per year, at times designated by the Council, to consider problems which may affect the Council and concern the administration of justice in the State of Alaska.

Section 4. Special Meetings.

When a vacancy in the office of justice, judge, or public defender actually occurs or is otherwise determined to be lawfully impending, the chairperson shall call a special meeting of the Judicial Council within the time-frame required by law. The chairperson shall also call a special meeting of the Council upon the request of four or more members to consider such business as may be specified in the request; at such meeting, the Council may also consider such other business as may come before the Council with the consent of four or more of the members present. The chairperson shall fix the time and place of such meeting not more than 30 days from the date of receipt of such request.

Section 5. Public Hearings.

The Council may hold public hearings on all matters relating to the administration of justice as it deems appropriate and in such places as it determines advisable.

Section 6. Executive Sessions.

The Council may determine as permitted by law whether its proceedings will be conducted in executive session. This determination must be made in a session open to the public and the decision to hold an executive session must be supported by the concurrence of four or more members. No subjects may be considered at the executive session except those mentioned in the motion calling for the executive session, unless auxiliary to the main question. No action may be taken in executive session.

Section 7. Place of Meeting.

Insofar as may be practicable, meetings should be held in the area of the State most directly affected by the subject matter under consideration, or elsewhere as determined advisable.

Section 8. Notice of Meeting: Waiver.

Written notice of each meeting shall be mailed to all members of the Council as far in advance as practicable but in any event not less than five days before the date fixed for each meeting. Presence at a meeting of the Council without objection shall constitute waiver of notice.

ARTICLE V
Voting and Quorum

Section 1. Voting.

All members of the Council present shall be entitled to vote on all matters coming before the Council, except that the chair shall only vote when to do so would change the result. The Council shall act by concurrence of four or more members. All votes shall be taken in public session. Any member can vote in the affirmative or negative or abstain on any matter; However, a member who wishes to abstain shall so indicate before the question to be voted on is called and shall disclose the reasons for abstaining.

Section 2. Conflict of Interest; Disqualification.

No member may vote on any matter in which he or she has a substantial personal or pecuniary interest. In addition, a member of the Council who believes that his or her personal or business relationship to any applicant for a judicial or public defender vacancy or to any judge or justice being evaluated for retention purposes might prevent such member from fairly and objectively considering the qualifications of such person, or might otherwise involve a conflict of interest or create the appearance thereof, shall disclose the circumstances of the actual or apparent conflict to the Council and shall disqualify himself or herself from discussing or voting on the nomination or retention of that person.

Section 3. Quorum.

Four members of the Council shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting.

Section 4. Rules of Order.

Robert's Rules of Order Revised will govern the meetings of the Council insofar as they do not conflict with these bylaws.

ARTICLE VI
Committees

Section 1. Standing Committees.

The Council may establish such standing committees from time to time as may be deemed appropriate for the efficient and effective conduct of Council business. Standing committee assignments shall be made annually by the chairperson. The function of each committee shall be to monitor Council activities between meetings, to provide guidance and advice to staff, and to report to the Council at regularly scheduled meetings regarding the committees' areas of oversight. Each committee shall include at least one attorney and one non-attorney member. To the maximum extent possible, Council members should be permitted to serve on the committee or committees of their choice. The following standing committees may be established:

- (A) Finance, audit, and administration;
- (B) Programs and research;
- (C) Judicial and public defender selection and retention;
- (D) Legislation.

Section 2. Ad Hoc Committees.

The chairperson may direct the establishment of ad hoc committees from time to time as may be deemed appropriate. Ad hoc committees shall report to the Council on their activities and may make recommendations for Council action.

ARTICLE VII Procedure for Submitting Judicial and Public Defender Nominations to the Governor

Section 1. Notice of Vacancy; Recruitment.

Whenever a vacancy to be filled by appointment exists, or is about to occur, in any supreme court, court of appeals, superior court, or district court of this state, or in the office of public defender, the Council, by mail or by such other publication means as may be appropriate, shall notify all active members of the Alaska Bar Association of the vacancy, and shall invite applications from qualified judges or other members of the bar of this state for consideration by the Council for recommendation to the governor. Council members may also encourage persons believed by such members to possess the requisite qualifications for judicial or public defender office to submit their applications for consideration and may cooperate with judicial selection committees of the state or local bar associations or of such other organizations as may be appropriate in the identification and recruitment of potential candidates.

Section 2. Application Procedure.

Each applicant for a judicial or chief public defender position shall obtain and complete an application for appointment provided by the Council and shall comply with all the requirements therein. Such application may request such information as deemed appropriate to a determination of qualification for office, including but not limited to the following: family and marital history; bar and/or judicial discipline history; criminal record; involvement as a party in litigation; credit history; physical and mental condition and history; community activities; academic and employment history; military record; and representative clientele.

Section 3. Evaluation and Investigation of Applicants' Qualifications.

(A) Judicial Qualifications Polls. The Judicial Council may conduct judicial qualifications polls in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Council and cause the same to be circulated among the members of the Alaska Bar Association. The poll should be relevant to criteria listed in Article 1, Section 1 of these bylaws. If the Alaska Bar Association conducts a qualifications poll satisfactory to the Council, the Council may recognize such poll. The Judicial Council may conduct such other surveys and evaluations of candidates' qualifications as may be deemed appropriate.

(B) Investigation. The Council and its staff shall investigate the background, experience, and other qualifications of an applicant under consideration for a judicial or a public defender vacancy, and may call witnesses before it for such purposes.

(C) Candidate Interviews; Expenses. The Council may, when and where it deems desirable, conduct a personal interview with one, some, or all applicants for any judicial or public defender vacancy. Candidates requested to appear before the Council for such interviews shall appear in person; when, however, a candidate for good cause shown is unable to personally attend such interview, the Council may arrange for an interview by telephone or other electronic communication means with such applicant, and such alternative interview as may be appropriate, including but not

limited to interview of such candidate by a committee of the Council at such other time and place as may be convenient. A candidate may choose to be interviewed publicly or in executive session, to protect the candidate's privacy interests consistent with Alaska's Open Meetings Act. The choice to interview publicly or in executive session will have no bearing on the council's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications.

A candidate's expenses for judicial or public defender office are that candidate's responsibility. The Council may reimburse candidates for travel expenses in the Council's discretion. The cost of a telephone interview requested by the Council shall be paid by the Council.

Section 4. Nomination Procedure; Recommendation of Best Qualified Candidates.

The Council shall select two or more candidates who stand out as the most qualified under the criteria set out in Article I, Section 1 of these bylaws, considering (a) other candidates who have applied; (b) the position applied for; and (c) the community in which the position is to be located. The names of the selected candidates shall be submitted to the governor in alphabetical order; but if the council's vote does not result in selecting at least two applicants who are sufficiently qualified, the council shall decline to submit any names and will re-advertise the position.

Section 5. Reconsideration

The Council will not reconsider the names submitted to the governor after the nominees are submitted unless the disability or death of one or more nominees leaves the governor with less than two names for filling a judicial vacancy. If the governor requests additional nominees in such a situation, the Council will submit additional names so that the governor has at least two nominees for each vacancy. The Council may select additional names from the original applicants for the position or may re-advertise for the position.

Section 6. Publication and Review of Procedures

The Council shall establish and follow written forms and procedures for the nomination of attorneys who apply to be justices, judges, and public defender. The Council shall publish the bylaws and procedures in its biennial report to the Alaska Supreme Court and legislature, post them on its website, and provide them to applicants. The Council shall review these procedures at intervals not to exceed three years.

ARTICLE VIII

Review of Judicial Performance

Section 1. Retention Election Evaluation.

Prior to each general election in which one or more justices or judges has expressed the intention to be a candidate for retention election, the Council shall conduct evaluations of the qualifications and performance of such justices and judges and shall make the results of evaluations public. Evaluations may be based upon the results of a judicial performance survey conducted among all active members of the Alaska Bar Association and other members, retired or inactive, that the Council chooses. Evaluations also may be based upon such other surveys, interviews, or research

into judicial performance as may be deemed appropriate, including but not limited to, any process that encourages expanded public participation and comment regarding candidate qualifications.

Section 2. Recommendation.

Based upon the evaluative data, the Council may recommend that any justice or judge either be retained or not be retained. The Council may actively support the candidacy of every incumbent judge recommended to be retained, and may actively oppose the candidacy of every incumbent judge whom it recommends not be retained. The Council shall publicize its recommendations.

Section 3. Judicial Performance Evaluation.

The Council may conduct evaluations of judges or other judicial officers, other than at the time of retention elections, and may make the results of the evaluations public.

Section 4. Publication and Review of Procedures

The Council shall establish and follow written procedures for the evaluation of justices and judges. The Council shall publish the procedures in its biennial report to the Alaska Supreme Court and legislature, post them on its website, and provide them to justices and judges. The Council shall review these procedures at intervals not to exceed four years.

ARTICLE IX

Extra-Council Communications

Members of the public may wish to communicate their thoughts about the qualifications of applicants and the performance of judicial officers to individual Council members. All written communications between a Council member and any other person or organization regarding the qualifications of any applicant or the performance of any judicial officer should be forwarded to all other members; all oral communications regarding such matters should be shared with other members. Council members may encourage people to communicate with the Council in writing or at a public hearing.

Council members may discuss their individual views about the qualifications of applicants and the performance of judicial officers with members of the public, including the applicants and judicial officers. Council members may not publicly discuss the views of other Council members about the qualifications of applicants and the performance of judicial officers. Communications and deliberations among Council members that occur in executive session, including discussion about the qualifications of an applicant or the performance of a judicial officer shall be kept confidential in accordance with the law and Council bylaws.

ARTICLE X

Access to Council Records

Section 1. Public Records.

All records of the Judicial Council, unless confidential or privileged, are public as provided in AS 40.25.110. The public shall have access to all public records in accordance with AS 40.25.120.

Public Records include:

1. Council bylaws and policy statements;
2. Minutes of Council meetings;
3. Final Council reports;
4. Financial accounts and transactions;
5. Library materials; and
6. All records other than those excepted in this bylaw.

Section 2. Right to Privacy.

Materials that, if made public, would violate an individual's right to privacy under Art. I, Section 22 of the Alaska Constitution shall be confidential. Confidential materials are not open for public inspection and include:

1. Solicited communications relating to the qualifications of judicial or public defender vacancy applicants, or judicial officers;
2. Unsolicited communications relating to the qualifications of a judicial or public defender applicant or judicial officer, where the source requests confidentiality;
3. Those portions of the "application for judicial appointment" and "judge questionnaire" that reveal sensitive personal information entitled to protection under law;
4. Investigative research materials and internal communications that reveal sensitive personal information entitled to protection under law; and
5. Contents of Council employees' and members' personnel records, except that dates of employment, position titles, classification and salaries of present and/or past state employment for all employees are public information. In addition, application forms, resumes and other documents submitted to the Judicial Council in support of applications for any position with the Council grade 16 or above are public information.

Section 3. Deliberative Process.

Materials that are part of the deliberative process of the Judicial Council, including those prepared by Council employees, are privileged and confidential if their disclosure would cause substantial and adverse effects to the Council that outweigh the need for access. These materials

generally include drafts and computations prior to final document approval, internal memoranda conveying personal opinions, and other pre-decisional documents not incorporated into public records under this bylaw.

Section 4. Other Information.

Information required or authorized to be kept confidential by law is not a public record.

Section 5. Privileged Communications.

Communications that are legally privileged are not public information. These communications include but are not limited to communications between the Council and its attorney made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the Council.

Section 6. Release of Information.

If a record contains both disclosable and nondisclosable information, the nondisclosable information will be deleted and the disclosable information will be disclosed. Information that otherwise would not be disclosable may be released to the subject of that information or to the public if it is in a form that protects the privacy rights of individuals and does not inhibit candid debate during the decision-making process.

ARTICLE XI Office of Judicial Council

The Council shall designate an office of the Council in such location as it deems appropriate. Records and files of the Council's business shall be maintained by the executive director at this location.

ARTICLE XII Appropriations

The Council will seek such appropriations of funds by the Alaska Legislature and other funding sources as it deems appropriate to carry out its constitutional and statutory functions.

ARTICLE XIII Bylaw Review and Amendment

The Council shall review these bylaws at intervals not to exceed six years. These bylaws may be altered or amended by the Judicial Council by concurrence of four or more members, provided reasonable notice of proposed amendments has been provided to all Council members.

These bylaws adopted by the Alaska Judicial Council, this 15th day of February 1966; amended November 10, 1966; June 18, 1970; March 30, 1972; February 15, 1973; May 26, 1983; December 10, 1986; March 19, 1987; January 14, 1989; November 2, 1993; June 26, 1996; December 9, 1996; September 23-24, 1997; July 6-7, 1998; July 15, 2002; September 22, 2005; November 28, 2005; October 14, 2006.

Deliberately left blank

Appendix D
Judicial Selection Procedures

Deliberately left blank

Appendix D

The following information is given to each applicant for a judicial position. The Council updates this description of procedures periodically, so the information below should not be relied upon as the most current.

Alaska Judicial Council Procedures for Nominating Judicial Candidates

The Alaska Judicial Council is a constitutionally created state agency that evaluates the applications of persons seeking judicial appointment and nominates two or more qualified applicants to the governor for appointment to fill existing or impending vacancies.¹ The following is a brief summary of the judicial selection process - the steps that an applicant must take in order to be considered for a judicial appointment and the steps that are taken by the Judicial Council to ensure that applicants are fairly evaluated and that the most qualified are nominated. These procedures are published in the Council's biennial reports to the supreme court and to the legislature and are posted on the Council's website. Every applicant receives a copy of these procedures.

I. Application Procedures

A. Notice of Vacancy; Recruitment

1. Notice of Vacancy

As soon as possible after learning that a vacancy exists or is about to occur in the supreme court, court of appeals, superior court, or district court, the Council issues a press release announcing the vacancy, posts a notice on its website, and sends notice of the vacancy to all active members of the Alaska Bar Association. The notice describes the judicial vacancy, states the statutory requirements for the position, invites all qualified attorneys to apply, tells interested attorneys how to obtain applications, and sets the deadline for applying. The notice may also state that the Council has the discretion to use applications to make nominations for other pending or impending vacancies at the same level of court in the same location. The application deadline is typically three to four weeks after the Council announces the vacancy.

2. Recruitment

Council members and staff may actively encourage qualified persons to apply for a judicial position. The Council may cooperate with selection committees of the state bar or local bar associations, or other appropriate organizations to identify and recruit potential applicants. The Council may extend an application deadline to encourage more applications.

¹ Article IV, Section 5 of the Alaska Constitution; Titles 15 and 22 of the Alaska Statutes.

B. Submission of Applications

Application forms for open judicial positions may be obtained upon request from the Council's office and are also available on the Council's website. Each applicant seeking to be considered for nomination by the Council to an open judicial position must file a completed Judicial Council application form and must comply with all requirements described in the form.

1. Background Information

The application form asks for information that may be relevant to determine qualifications for office, including but not limited to: academic and employment history; bar and/or judicial discipline history; community service and pro bono activity; community activity and non-legal interests; involvement as a party in litigation; criminal record; credit history; military record; the addresses of all of the applicant's residences in the past five years; and the applicant's ability to perform essential job functions with or without reasonable accommodation. The Council asks each applicant to provide a photograph to assist members in recalling the interviews. The Council also asks whether an applicant prefers to be interviewed in public session or in executive session.

2. References

The Council requires an applicant to submit the names of three professional references and two character references. The Council asks the applicant to submit the names of attorneys and judges involved in three of the applicant's cases in the past three years that went to trial and three of the applicant's cases in the past three years that did not go to trial but in which the applicant did substantial work. An applicant must submit the names of persons who can verify and comment about the applicant's past and present employment.

3. Nature of Law Practice

An applicant is asked to provide detailed information about the applicant's practice of law within the past five years, including the percentage of practice in state versus federal court, the percentage of practice in civil versus criminal matters, and the percentage of practice at the appellate versus trial court level. An applicant must describe how often the applicant appears in court and must provide an estimate of how many jury and non-jury trials, appellate matters, and administrative hearings the applicant has handled within the past five years.

4. Writing Sample

The Council requires a sample of the applicant's writing ten to twenty pages in length, prepared solely by the applicant within the past five years. The Council also asks the applicant to provide a list of any legal publications the applicant has authored.

5. Information Needed to Determine Potential Conflicts

An applicant is asked to provide the amount and source of the applicant's income for the past three years and the names and occupations of the applicant's immediate family members. The applicant is asked to identify any public or political office the applicant has held. The applicant is asked to provide information about his or her membership in legal and non-legal organizations and other information bearing on potential conflicts of interest.

6. Short Biography to Post on Council Website

The Council requires an applicant to submit a brief written summary of his or her background, legal education, and legal experience. The Council posts applicants' summaries on its website and invites attorneys to review them when responding to Council surveys. Applicants may also choose to have their photograph posted on the website with their biographical summary.

7. Number of Copies; Re-Use of Applications

Applicants must submit twelve copies of the completed questionnaire and writing sample and twelve copies of their photograph to the Council on or by the date set forth in the notice of vacancy. If an applicant applies for another judicial position within six months of a prior application, the applicant must provide written notice to the Council of his or her intent to apply for the new vacancy. The Council may permit the applicant to rely on his or her most recent application, but requires the applicant to provide any supplemental information.

C. Confidentiality

1. Non-Public Materials

The Council maintains the confidentiality of sensitive and highly personal information in applications, including but not limited to: home and e-mail addresses; home and mobile telephone numbers; social security number; income; names and occupations of immediate family members; formal disciplinary or ethical complaints, charges or grievances brought against the applicant as an attorney or judge that did not result in public discipline; medical and health history; and the financial interests of the applicant. The Council maintains as non-public material all solicited counsel questionnaires, reference letters, and employment verifications except those that the authors state in writing can be provided to the governor. The Council maintains as non-public material all unsolicited comments and letters for which the author requests confidentiality or which the Council in its discretion believes should remain confidential to protect third parties.

2. Public Materials

Information not described above as non-public material is set forth in a separate part of the application and is available to the public.

II. Initial Review of Applications; Background Investigation

A. Initial Review for Completeness and Compliance with Statutory Requirements

As soon as possible after applications are received, Council staff review the applications for completeness and may reject non-conforming applications. Staff review applications to determine whether the applicant meets the minimum statutory requirements for the position, including active practice of law and residency requirements. Staff may request additional information from an applicant to resolve any potential problems the applicant may have in meeting statutory requirements. If the additional information does not resolve the problem, staff will refer the issue to the Council for it to make the determination. The Council may choose to determine the applicant's eligibility immediately, to request further investigation, or to defer a decision pending completion of the interview process. In deciding if an applicant meets an active practice requirement, the Council will consider whether the applicant has substantially complied with the requirement.

B. Background Investigation

1. Reference Check

Council staff begin an investigation to confirm and supplement information provided by the applicant. The Council writes to all of the applicant's references and former employers. References and prior employers are asked to comment on the applicants' qualifications under the criteria set forth in Article 1, Section 1 of the Council's bylaws and Section VI of these procedures, among other things. Attorneys and judges identified by the applicant as having had recent experience with the applicant are sent questionnaires that ask about these qualities and request the respondent's opinion about the applicant's suitability for nomination. Questionnaires may be submitted electronically via the Council's website or returned to the Council through the mail. Questionnaire respondents are provided with the option of signing their name. The Council does not share with applicants the materials it solicits, including reference letters, employment verification letters, or questionnaires. The Council may share with applicants the substance of a solicited comment. The Council does not reveal the identity of the respondent unless the respondent waives anonymity. The reference check takes about six weeks to complete.

2. Background Investigation

Council staff review bar files for the applicant's history with and standing in the bar, and fee arbitration and grievance histories, whether action was taken or not. It further investigates the allegations if necessary. An applicant's credit report is obtained. The applicant's Martindale Hubble rating, if any, is reviewed. Staff investigate whether the applicant has been a party to any civil litigation and if so, what the applicant's involvement was in that litigation and how it was resolved. Staff investigate whether the applicant has had any criminal history, traffic violations, or administrative actions against his or her driver's license. Staff review the applicant's potential conflicts of interest as indicated on the application, or from attorney or public comment or other sources that could pose a significant problem for the proper functioning of the courts if the applicant is appointed. Staff members obtain and/or verify information on pro bono or other legal service activity. Staff members may otherwise investigate any specific verifiable information obtained from any source about an applicant's fitness for office. This may include speaking with the source of that information, researching the Internet, newspapers, court files, transcripts, hearing records, or otherwise attempting to ascertain the veracity of the information. The background investigation

normally takes about two months to complete. Because the Council continually solicits and receives public feedback about applicants, a background investigation can extend until the time the Council votes on its nominations.

3. Evaluation of Writing Samples

After the application deadline, staff evaluate applicant writing samples for organization, use of language, correct grammar and syntax and other characteristics of good writing. Staff also review the samples for the quality of the applicant's legal research and analysis.

III. Bar Poll; Public Comment

A. Bar Poll

1. Form of Poll

The Council surveys all active and in-state inactive members of the Alaska Bar Association. The bar poll asks attorneys to rate each candidate on a five point scale [1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)] on six criteria: professional competence, integrity, judicial temperament, fairness, suitability of experience, and overall professional qualifications. Survey respondents indicate whether they base their numerical ratings on direct professional experience, other personal contacts, or professional reputation, or whether they are declining to evaluate a particular candidate due to insufficient knowledge. Respondents with direct professional experience with an applicant are asked to specify whether that experience is substantial and recent, moderate, or limited. Respondents are asked to provide demographic information including their length, location, and type of law practice and their gender.

The Council asks respondents to submit comments about an applicant. Respondents are not required to provide their names with each comment but are encouraged to do so. Respondents are reminded of their ethical obligation to be truthful in all comments submitted. Respondents are assured that their names, if provided, will not be given to applicants and will not be used by the Council to identify the respondent's survey ratings. Sample pages of a bar poll are appended (Appendix B).

2. Method of Polling

The Council uses an electronic survey and a paper survey to poll attorneys. Surveys are distributed about one week after the application deadline. Attorneys have three to four weeks to respond to the Council's surveys.

The Council maintains an updated list of active and in-state inactive members of the Alaska Bar Association. Each name on the list is associated with a control number. Immediately after the application deadline, the Council sends the complete list to an independent contractor, typically a workgroup affiliated with the University of Alaska. This contractor receives paper surveys and analyzes all survey data.

The Council maintains an updated list of active and in-state inactive members of the Alaska Bar Association who have provided their e-mail address to the Alaska Bar Association or to the Council. Each attorney on this list is assigned a control number that corresponds to the control number on the complete list of attorneys described in the preceding paragraph. A different

independent contractor administers the electronic survey. Immediately after the application deadline, the Council forwards its list of e-mail addresses to the contractor administering the electronic survey.

a. Electronic Bar Survey

The contractor sends an e-mail invitation to participate in the bar poll to attorneys on the Council's e-mail list. The invitation provides an attorney with a password encoded link to access the survey. The invitation reminds an attorney to not respond to the paper survey if the attorney responds to the electronic survey. The electronic survey asks attorneys whether they wish to discontinue receiving paper surveys. Attorneys receiving electronic surveys are sent an e-mail reminder prior to the response deadline, if they have not yet responded to the survey. Electronic survey data are encrypted during transmission to preserve the confidentiality of the data. The contractor strips the response of its e-mail address. Thereafter, the contractor identifies the survey response by its control number. Within a few days of the survey deadline, the contractor who administers the electronic survey transmits the data to the independent contractor who receives paper surveys and analyzes all survey data.

b. Paper Bar Survey

The Council sends paper surveys to active and in-state inactive members who have not indicated that they wish to discontinue receiving paper surveys. The paper survey reminds an attorney to not respond to the electronic survey if the attorney responds to the paper survey. Respondents are instructed to place the completed survey inside a plain envelope marked "confidential" and to place that envelope in a self-addressed, pre-paid postage return envelope containing the respondent's name and signature. Upon receipt, the contractor separates the outside envelope from the survey form. Thereafter, the contractor identifies the survey response by its control number.

3. Method of Evaluating Poll Results

a. Review for Duplicate Responses

When the electronic survey data are received by the contractor responsible for survey analysis, the contractor eliminates the possibility of duplicate responses by comparing the control numbers of paper and electronic survey responses. If the contractor identifies duplicate responses, the contractor discards the survey that is less complete. The contractor then assigns a new, randomly assigned control number to all survey responses.

b. Numerical Ratings

The contractor prepares a statistical analysis of all survey responses, including average ratings for each quality for each candidate by range. Ratings based on personal contacts or professional reputation are not included in most average ratings. The report provides detailed information about ratings by different demographic groups. The Council may use these data to identify patterns in poll results. The Council may ask the contractor to analyze the report for statistical or other anomalies in the data. The report includes a discussion of methodology and data management procedures. The Council publishes the report of numerical ratings on its website. Sample pages from an evaluation report are appended. (Appendix C)

c. Bar Poll Comments

The contractor also prepares a separate report that includes a transcription of all respondent survey comments about applicants. If a respondent signed a comment, the respondent's name is transcribed with the comment. If a respondent did not sign a comment, the comment is associated with the new control number assigned by the contractor. The assignment of a new control number precludes the Council from identifying the author of a bar poll comment from a survey respondent who wants to remain anonymous. Staff may investigate substantive comments submitted in the bar poll.

4. Distribution of Bar Poll Results

The contractor provides the Council with its analysis and a transcript of all bar survey comments two to three weeks after the survey response deadline. Within a few days of receiving the analysis, Council staff inform applicants of survey results.

a. Numerical Ratings

Staff inform the applicant of his or her ratings and provide the applicant with a general idea of the spectrum of ratings received by applicants. Staff do not identify the scores of other applicants.

About two weeks after staff have contacted all applicants about their ratings, the Council publicly announces the numerical ratings received by applicants who have not withdrawn. An applicant's ratings are not released publicly if the applicant withdraws sufficiently in advance of publication. The Council distributes a press release that summarizes survey ratings. All applicants who have not withdrawn receive a copy of the complete survey rating analysis. The Council posts the press release and the survey rating analysis on its website.

b. Bar Poll Comments

Council staff edit the transcribed bar poll comments to remove information that might compromise the identities of respondents. Staff send applicants their written edited comments about one week after all applicants have been contacted by telephone. The edited comments indicate whether the comments were signed or unsigned, but no identifying information about the survey respondent is provided. Bar poll comments about applicants are not released publicly.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

Immediately after the application deadline has passed, the Council issues a press release announcing the names of applicants; it also publicizes and posts on its website the place and approximate date of the Council meeting set for candidate interviews and the Council's vote. In its press release and on its website, the Council invites comments from the public about applicants. The public is invited to write, telephone, or fax comments to the Council. The public is also invited to submit comments via the Council's website.

The Council holds a public hearing to receive public comments. If feasible, the hearing is held in the community where the judge will sit. The hearing typically coincides with the time set for applicant interviews. The Council advertises its public hearing through paid advertisements in major newspapers in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau, and in the location of the vacancy if different. The Council may take public comments telephonically at the Council's expense.

IV. Distribution of Applicant Materials to Council Members

Council staff compile all solicited materials and any unsolicited materials submitted to the Council about applicants. Approximately three weeks prior to the Council's meeting to interview applicants, Council staff send a packet of materials to each Council member about the applicants. This packet includes:

1. copies of the written applications
2. applicant writing samples and a memo prepared by staff analyzing the samples
3. a staff memorandum summarizing staff review of the applicant's discipline files, credit, civil, and criminal history, and conflicts of interest
4. memoranda concerning particular matters investigated by staff
5. a report of the complete bar poll numerical ratings and statistical analysis
6. an unedited transcription of attorney comments submitted in the bar poll in a format that identifies information omitted in the edited version received by each applicant
7. if applicable, bar poll ratings received by the applicant in prior applications or judicial retention elections
8. all letters of reference
9. all responses to questionnaires solicited by the Council from attorneys and judges with recent experience with the applicant
10. all public comments
11. any unsolicited materials received concerning the applicant

These materials typically exceed one hundred pages of written materials per applicant. Council members review all of these materials before meeting to interview applicants.

V. Interview Procedures

A. Prior to the Interview

1. Scheduling

Within a few days after bar poll results are publicly released, the Council schedules specific interview times for applicants. The Council sends letters to applicants notifying them of the date, time, and location of their interview. Applicants are given about four to six weeks notice of their specific interview time. The Council posts a schedule of interview times on its website. In its advertisements and notices of a Council meeting to interview applicants, the Council invites the public to contact the Council or review the Council's website for an interview schedule.

The Council typically interviews all applicants. If an applicant applies for multiple judicial openings that are simultaneously pending, the applicant is interviewed only once for all vacancies.

Interviews usually occur in the location of the vacancy. The Council interviews applicants in person or may arrange an interview by telephone or other electronic means, at its discretion. Expenses incurred by the applicant are the applicant's responsibility. The Council has the discretion to reimburse applicants for travel expenses or the cost of a telephone interview.

2. Public and Private Interviews

The application gives applicants a choice between an interview in public session or an interview in executive session. Applicants may change their request in writing at any time before the interview starts. An applicant's choice of a public or private interview has no bearing on the Council's determination of the applicant's qualifications or on the questions the Council may ask. The Council notes on its schedule which interviews are expected to be in public session and which are expected to be in executive session. To the extent possible, the Council schedules public interviews consecutively.

3. Communicating Comments About Applicants

Without identifying the source, staff inform an applicant of comments about the applicant that the Council may have received that were not included in the bar survey comments forwarded to the applicant.

4. Disclosures by Council Members

Immediately before interviewing an applicant, the Council convenes briefly in executive session and each Council member discloses to other Council members any relevant information known or communicated to the Council member about the applicant that other members may not know.

B. The Interview

1. Length of Interview

An interview usually lasts about forty-five minutes.

2. The Interview Process

The interview is preceded by an introduction of the applicant to all Council members and any Council staff present. The chief justice typically begins the interview by asking the applicant to provide an opening statement concerning the applicant's interest in and qualifications for the position. Each Council member is then given an opportunity to question the applicant. After all Council members have completed the first round of questioning, any Council member may ask additional questions. The chief justice then has an opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the interview, applicants may make a brief closing statement and address any matters not raised during the interview.

3. Focus of Interview Questions: Selection Criteria

The Council's interview questions will focus on matters relevant to determining the applicant's qualifications under the criteria set out in Article I, Section 1 of the Council's bylaws. Council members may inquire about any relevant concerns raised in the materials provided to the Council or any issues arising from the applicant's testimony before the Council.

Members will not ask questions designed to elicit views on issues likely to be litigated before the applicant, if appointed. Nor will Council members ask about an applicant's political affiliations, religious beliefs, or other "prohibited considerations" listed below in Part VI, except when reliable evidence or the applicant's own testimony suggests that questions relating to these topics may be reasonably necessary to address specific concerns about the applicant's qualifications. Thus, for example, if the Council received credible and specific information indicating that an applicant's actions on the bench might be influenced by religious bias, Council members could pursue the issue to ensure that the applicant would be able to act fairly and impartially as a judge. Similarly, if an applicant made statements about having strong political affiliations or views, Council members could ask follow-up questions to confirm that these affiliations and views would not carry over to the applicant's judicial performance.

4. Questions Based on Confidential or Anonymous Source

When questioning an applicant about information received from a source who was promised confidentiality, Council members will phrase their questions to avoid revealing the confidential source's identity, and the Council will not otherwise disclose the source to the applicant during the interview or at any other time. When a Council member asks a question concerning unfavorable information received from a confidential or anonymous source and it appears that the confidentiality or anonymity of the Council's source might impair the applicant's ability to answer the question, the applicant's inability to respond fully will be taken into account. If the applicant can shed any light on the allegation, the Council will consider the applicant's explanation; if not, the applicant's failure to explain will have no negative effect on the Council's decision. An applicant who is asked such a question has no "burden" to defend against the confidential or anonymous allegation; and the mere fact that a Council member asks about a confidential or anonymous allegation does not imply that the Council member or the Council as a whole assume that the allegation is true. Although Council members may ask such questions to determine if the applicant might be able to shed light on the issue, members always bear in mind that, ultimately, anonymous allegations cannot be held against an applicant unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant.

VI. Nomination Procedures

A. Criteria for Evaluating Qualifications of Individual Applicants

Article I, Section 1 of the Council's Bylaws requires Council members to determine the qualifications of individual judicial applicants by considering the following selection criteria:

- Professional Competence, Including Written and Oral Communication Skills. When addressing professional competence, Council members consider intellectual capacity, legal judgment, diligence, substantive and procedural knowledge of the law, organizational and administrative skills, and the ability to work well with a variety of types of people. Because communications

play a vital role in any judge's work, Council members assess an applicant's ability to communicate in writing and speaking. Members consider the applicant's ability to discuss factual and legal issues in clear, logical, and accurate legal writing. They also consider the applicant's effectiveness in communicating orally in a way that will readily be understood and respected by people from all walks of life.

- **Integrity.** In evaluating integrity, Council members consider whether the applicant has demonstrated a consistent history of honesty and high moral character in the applicant's professional and personal life. Members also consider the applicant's respect for professional duties arising under the codes of professional and judicial conduct, as well as the applicant's ability to understand the need to maintain propriety and the appearance of propriety.
- **Fairness.** To assess an applicant's fairness, Council members examine whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to be impartial to all persons and groups of people and has shown a commitment to equal justice under the law. Members look for applicants who have shown themselves to be open-minded and capable of deciding issues according to the law, even when the law conflicts with their personal views.
- **Temperament.** In assessing an applicant's temperament, Council members consider whether the applicant possesses compassion and humility; whether the applicant has a history of courtesy and civility in dealing with others; whether the applicant has shown an ability to maintain composure under stress; and whether the applicant is able to control anger and maintain calmness and order.
- **Judgment, Including Common Sense.** To determine an applicant's judgment and common sense, Council members look for a sound balance between abstract knowledge and practical reality: members consider whether, in making decisions in the legal arena or in other spheres of life, the applicant has demonstrated the ability to make prompt decisions that resolve difficult problems in a way that makes practical sense within the constraints of any applicable rules or governing principles.
- **Legal and Life Experience.** Council members consider both legal and life experience. They evaluate the amount and breadth of an applicant's legal experience and the suitability of that experience for the position sought, including trial and other courtroom experience and administrative skills. At the same time, Council members look for broader qualities reflected in the applicant's life experiences, such as the diversity of the applicant's personal and educational history, exposure to persons of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and demonstrated interests in areas outside the legal field.
- **Demonstrated Commitment to Public and Community Service.** In assessing an applicant's commitment to public and community service, Council members consider the extent to which an applicant has demonstrated a commitment to the community generally and to improving access to the justice system in particular.

B. Initial Discussion of Individual Applicant's Qualifications

Immediately after concluding an individual applicant's interview, the Council discusses that applicant to enable each Council member to evaluate the applicant's qualifications under the selection criteria described above and in Article I, Section 1 of the Council's Bylaws. The Council holds the discussion in executive session to promote candid discussion about the qualifications of applicants. Each Council member is given an opportunity to comment on that member's assessment of the applicant; the order of discussion follows the order in which Council members questioned the applicant.

At this stage, the discussion centers on the individual applicant's strengths and weaknesses under the selection criteria. Council members do not decide which applicants rank as most qualified among all the applicants. Each Council member independently assesses the individual applicant's qualifications. The Council does not attempt to reach a consensus, and no vote occurs.

After each member has spoken, all members have an opportunity to make further comments. The discussion then ends, and the Council turns to the next applicant interview, if any is scheduled. The Council repeats the same procedure until all candidates have been interviewed and their individual qualifications have been discussed.

C. Deliberation to Determine Most Qualified Applicants

After all applicants have been interviewed, the Council deliberates on the entire slate of candidates. By this time, each Council member has evaluated the individual qualifications of all applicants under the criteria described in Article I, Section 1 of the bylaws; the deliberations now turn to comparing and ranking all applicants so that each member can identify the candidates whose overall qualifications, in that member's view, make them most qualified to be nominated. The procedure for making this determination is spelled out in Article VIII, Section 4 of the Council's bylaws. This section requires Council members to select the candidates who are most qualified under the criteria described in Article I, Section 1 by considering:

- **All Candidates Who Have Applied.** Under the procedures set out in Article VIII, Section 4, each Council member compares the relative standing of all applicants, relying on that member's independent judgment as to each candidate's individual qualifications according to Article 1, Section 1's selection criteria.
- **The Position Applied For.** Each Council member takes into account the specific level of judgeship applied for and considers the ability of each candidate to serve at that level.
- **The Community in Which the Position is Located.** Each Council member looks at the needs of the particular community where the new judge will serve.

In all cases, then, each Council member's final choice of the most qualified applicants will reflect a relative determination that depends in part on the strength of the entire slate of applicants, the nature of the open position, and the needs of the community to be served.

With these procedures in mind, the Council begins its deliberations. It deliberates in executive session to promote candid discussion about the qualifications of applicants in order to determine the most qualified applicants. The order of discussion usually follows the order in which Council members questioned the first applicant for the position; the chief justice speaks last. After each Council member has spoken, all members may engage in additional discussion until no member wishes to make further comments.

Although all members consider the views of other members and strive for consensus if possible, each ultimately makes an independent decision as to which candidates are most qualified under the Council's selection standards, voting on the basis of the member's personal judgment and conscience. No vote is taken in executive session. The Council has no policy regarding the ideal or “target” number of applicants who should be named as most qualified — either generally or for any given judicial position. In each case, the number of candidates nominated is simply determined by how many candidates receive four or more affirmative votes — a determination that occurs in the public session after the Council ends its deliberations.

D. Vote To Nominate Most Qualified Applicants

As soon as practicable after the Council completes its deliberations in executive session, it goes into public session and takes its formal vote to nominate the most qualified applicants. Each Council member votes according to that member’s personal assessment of the applicants’ qualifications as determined under the criteria and procedures set out in this statement of procedures. The vote consists of a roll call vote taken for each applicant individually, in alphabetical order. The Council's executive director ordinarily administers the voting. After the roll call is completed as to all applicants for a vacancy, the person administering the voting confirms that no further voting by regular members is needed and declares voting by regular members closed. At any time during the voting on a vacancy until the person administering the voting declares voting by regular members closed, Council members may change their vote for or against any applicant. Once voting by regular members is closed, the chief justice votes if the vote might affect the outcome. To be nominated, a candidate must receive four or more affirmative votes. If the Council votes to nominate fewer than two applicants it will decline to submit any names. Typically, the Council will re-advertise the position immediately.

E. Prohibited Considerations in Determining Qualifications and Voting

1. Anonymous Comments

Council members do not rely on anonymous comments unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant.

2. Discrimination

The Council refrains from any form of discrimination prohibited under state and federal law.

3. Religious and Political Beliefs

The Council does not consider an applicant's political or religious beliefs, but will consider whether the applicant's personal beliefs indicate a substantial bias or conflict of interest that could impede the proper functioning of the courts or show that the applicant would be unable to apply the law impartially.

4. Likelihood of appointment

The Council does not consider an applicant's likelihood of appointment by the governor.

VII. Post-Nomination Procedures

A. Notification of Applicants

At the interview, applicants are asked for contact numbers where they can be reached immediately after the Council's vote. As soon as possible after the Council completes its vote, the Council's executive director or designee telephones applicants about the Council's vote. The Council also sends each applicant written notice of its decisions. Nominations are posted on the Council's website as soon as possible after the meeting. The Council issues a press release about its nominations.

B. Transmittal to the Governor

1. Preparation of List of Nominated Candidates and Press Release

As soon as possible after the Council meeting, staff prepare a list of nominated candidates compiled in alphabetical order. Staff also prepare a press release listing the Council's nominees.

2. Call to Governor's Office

As soon as possible after individual applicants are notified, Council staff call the governor's office to communicate the Council's nominations.

3. Written Notification to Governor

On the first business day after the Council's vote, the Council sends the governor a letter listing the nominees in alphabetical order, accompanied by the following materials: the Council's vote tally; each nominee's application, including the confidential sections; the results of any qualification surveys, without comments provided to the Council in confidence; written responses solicited by the Council from persons identified by the nominee in his or her application as references, former employers, and attorneys and judges who had recent experience with the nominee, but only if these persons gave written permission to send their responses to the governor; and any unsolicited materials received by the Council about the nominee, unless the source requested, in writing, that the material be kept confidential.

C. Requests for Additional Names; Reconsideration

The Council does not reconsider its nominees after the names are submitted except in the case of death, disability, or withdrawal of a nominee. If the death, disability, or withdrawal of one or more nominees leaves the governor with fewer than two names for filling a vacancy, the Council

may, upon request of the governor, submit enough additional names so that the governor has at least two nominees for the vacancy. The Council will vote to determine if there are additional applicants who can be nominated from the original list of applicants. If no candidate receives sufficient votes to be nominated, the Council will re-advertise the position.

Effective date: October 3, 2005, amended October 14, 2006.

Attachment A
(Sample Judicial Council selection survey document)



alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969 (907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us> E-Mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Eleanor Andrews
Bill Gordon
Gigi Pilcher

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Douglas Baily
Robert B. Groseclose
Susan Orlansky

July 17, 2006

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Alexander O. Bryner
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

Dear Member of the Alaska Bar Association:

Attached is the bar survey for applicants for the current vacancies on the Anchorage and Palmer Superior Courts, Third Judicial District. Please refer to Professional Conduct Rule 8.2 concerning your obligation to provide truthful and candid opinions on the qualifications and integrity of these applicants.

The Council encourages narrative comments. A page for comments is provided for each applicant. An additional page is provided at the end of this booklet. If these pages are not sufficient please attach separate pages as needed.

The Council gives attorneys the option of identifying their written comments to the Council by signing comment pages. While optional, providing your name does tend to give comments more credibility with the Council. The Council does not consider unsigned comments unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant. Your name will not be provided to the applicant, and it can not be used by the Council to identify your ratings or your comments on other applicants. Survey comments will be shared with an applicant only after the comments have been edited to remove information that might identify the respondent. Note that you must write your name on each comment page for which you wish to identify yourself to the Council.

We ask that you complete and return the survey form no later than August 18, 2006, to Behavioral Health Research & Services (BHRS), P.O. Box 240207, Anchorage, Alaska 99524-9990. Alternatively, you may respond to the survey electronically over the Internet no later than August 18, 2006. If you respond to the electronic survey, please do not respond to this paper survey.

Very truly yours,


Larry Cohn
Executive Director

Introduction

Validation of Responses. A self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluation. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked "Confidential" and seal the envelope. Then use the self-addressed stamped envelope, being sure to sign in the space provided. The return envelope **MUST BE SIGNED** in order for your survey to be counted. (In the most recent survey, three unsigned surveys were excluded from tabulation.)

Confidentiality. All responses will be aggregated solely for statistical analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Responses to the demographic questions also are confidential. Demographic data are critical to our analysis; strict guidelines are followed to protect the identities of all respondents.

Return Date. Please complete and return this survey no later than August 18, 2006 to:

Behavioral Health Research & Services (BHRS)
P.O. Box 240207
Anchorage, Alaska 99524-9990

Demographic Questions

1. Type of Practice. Which of the following best describes your practice?(*CIRCLE ONE*)
 1. Private, solo
 2. Private, office of 2-5 attorneys
 3. Private, office of 6 or more attorneys
 4. Private corporate employee
 5. Judge or judicial officer
 6. Government
 7. Public service agency or organization (not government)
 8. Other (specify) _____
2. Length of Alaska Practice. How many years have you practiced law in Alaska? _____ years
3. Gender. _____ Male _____ Female
4. Cases Handled. The majority of your practice consists of (*CIRCLE ONE*)
 1. Prosecution
 2. Mainly criminal
 3. Mixed criminal and civil
 4. Mainly civil
 5. Other (specify) _____
5. Location of Practice. In which judicial district is **most** of your work conducted? (*CIRCLE ONE*)

1. First District	4. Fourth District
2. Second District	5. Outside Alaska
3. Third District	

Please consider each of the following candidates.

If you do not have sufficient knowledge to evaluate a candidate, please go to the next candidate.

Michael Spaan

Anchorage Superior Court, Third Judicial District

Basis for Evaluation

- A. Which of the following best describes the basis for your evaluation of this candidate? Direct professional experience is limited to direct contact with the applicant's professional work. This includes working with or against the attorney on a legal matter (i.e., a case, arbitration, negotiation. . .). (*check one*)
- Direct professional experience Professional reputation
 Other personal contacts Insufficient knowledge to evaluate this candidate (go to **next** candidate)
- B. If you checked direct professional experience, which of the following best describes the amount of that experience?
- Substantial and recent (within last 5 years) Moderate Limited
- C. Please rate the candidate on each of the following qualities by circling the number that best represents your evaluation. Candidates 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 candidate on any one quality, leave that one blank.

	1	2	3	4	5
1 PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE	POOR Lacking in knowledge and/or effectiveness	DEFICIENT Below-average performance occasionally	ACCEPTABLE Possesses sufficient knowledge and required skills	GOOD Usually knowledgeable and effective	EXCELLENT Meets the highest standards for knowledge and effectiveness
2 INTEGRITY	POOR Unconcerned with propriety and/or appearance, or acts in violation of codes of professional conduct	DEFICIENT Appears lacking in knowledge of codes of professional conduct and/or unconcerned with propriety or appearance at times	ACCEPTABLE Follows codes of professional conduct, respects propriety and appearance of propriety at all times	GOOD Above-average awareness of ethics, holds self to higher standard than most	EXCELLENT Outstanding integrity and highest standards of conduct
3 FAIRNESS	POOR Often shows strong bias for or against some person or groups	DEFICIENT Displays, verbally or otherwise, some bias for or against groups or persons	ACCEPTABLE Free of substantial bias or prejudice towards groups or persons	GOOD Above-average ability to treat all persons and groups impartially	EXCELLENT Unusually fair and impartial to all groups
4 JUDICIAL TEMPERAMENT	POOR Often lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	DEFICIENT Sometimes lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	ACCEPTABLE Possesses appropriate compassion, humility, and courtesy	GOOD Above-average compassion, humility, and courtesy	EXCELLENT Outstanding compassion, humility, and courtesy
5 SUITABILITY OF THIS CANDIDATE'S EXPERIENCE FOR THIS VACANCY	POOR Has little or no suitable experience	DEFICIENT Has less than suitable experience	ACCEPTABLE Has suitable experience	GOOD Has highly suitable experience	EXCELLENT Has the most suitable experience possible for this position
6 OVERALL RATING FOR THIS POSITION	POOR Has few qualifications for this position.	DEFICIENT Has insufficient qualifications for this position	ACCEPTABLE Has suitable qualifications for this position	GOOD Has highly suitable qualifications for this position	EXCELLENT Has exceptionally high qualifications for this position

Michael Spaan

Comments

Please add any comments you believe would aid the Judicial Council in its evaluations. The Council is particularly interested in your assessment of the applicant's professional competence, including written and oral communication skills; integrity; fairness; temperament; diligence; judgment, including common sense; legal and life experience and demonstrated commitment to public and community service. Please refer to Professional Conduct Rule 8.2 concerning your obligation to provide truthful opinions. If you need more space, please attach additional pages. Write the applicant's name on each additional page.

Print Name (Optional)

Anonymity

To promote a candid response, your comments remain anonymous to the applicant whether or not you sign your name. Providing your name is optional but does give your comments added credibility with Council members. The Council does not consider unsigned comments unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant. Your name will not be given to the applicant. Survey comments will be shared with an applicant only after the comments have been edited to remove information that might identify the respondent. BHRIS provides the Council with a separate comment section on each applicant. Thus, you will have to write your name on each comment page for which you wish to identify yourself to the Council.

Deliberately left blank

Appendix E
Judicial Appointment Log

Deliberately left blank

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1959 - Supreme Court - 3 new positions			
	William V. Boggess Robert Boochever J. Earl Cooper Edward V. Davis John H. Dimond John S. Hellenthal Walter Hodge Verne O. Martin M.E. Monagle Buell A. Nesbett Walter Sczudlo Thomas B. Stewart	William V. Boggess Robert Boochever John H. Dimond Walter Hodge M.E. Monagle Buell A. Nesbett <i>Meeting Date 7/16-17/1959</i>	John H. Dimond Walter Hodge Buell A. Nesbett <i>1959 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1959 - Ketchikan/Juneau Superior - 2 new positions			
	Floyd O. Davidson James M. Fitzgerald Verne O. Martin E.P. McCarron Thomas B. Stewart James von der Heydt Walter E. Walsh	E.P. McCarron Thomas B. Stewart James von der Heydt Walter E. Walsh <i>Meeting Date 10/12-13/1959</i>	James von der Heydt <i>Juneau</i> Walter E. Walsh <i>Ketchikan</i> <i>1959 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1959 - Nome Superior - new position			
	James M. Fitzgerald Hubert A. Gilbert Verne O. Martin James von der Heydt	Hubert A. Gilbert Verne O. Martin <i>Meeting Date 10/12-13/1959</i>	Hubert A. Gilbert <i>1959 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1959 - Anchorage Superior - 3 new positions			
	Harold J. Butcher Henry Camarot J. Earl Cooper Ralph H. Cottis Roger Cremo Edward V. Davis James M. Fitzgerald Everett W. Hepp Peter J. Kalamarides Verne O. Martin Stanley McCutcheon Ralph E. Moody Raymond Plummer William W. Renfrew Thomas B. Stewart James von der Heydt	Harold J. Butcher J. Earl Cooper Ralph H. Cottis Edward V. Davis James M. Fitzgerald Stanley McCutcheon Ralph E. Moody <i>Meeting Date 10/12-13/1959</i>	Edward V. Davis J. Earl Cooper James M. Fitzgerald <i>1959 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1959 - Fairbanks Superior - 2 new positions			
	H.O. Arend William V. Boggess James M. Fitzgerald Everett W. Hepp Verne O. Martin Warren A. Taylor Warren Wm. Taylor James von der Heydt	H.O. Arend William V. Boggess Everett W. Hepp Warren A. Taylor James von der Heydt <i>Meeting Date 10/12-13/1959</i>	H.O. Arend Everett W. Hepp <i>1959 by Gov. William Egan</i>
<i>Note: The Judicial Council has attempted to compile an accurate listing of applicants, nominees and appointees to judgeships since statehood. Please notify the Council if you know of changes or additions that should be made to this list.</i>			

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1960 - Supreme Court - Justice Walter Hodge			
	Judge H.O. Arend William V. Boggess Edward V. Davis Vern Forbes Verne O. Martin John Maude Robert McNealy M.E. Monagle Ralph E. Moody Warren A. Taylor Judge James von der Heydt	Judge H.O. Arend William V. Boggess M.E. Monagle <i>Meeting Date 3/12-13/1960</i>	H.O. Arend 1960 by Gov. William Egan
1960 - Fairbanks Superior - H. O. Arend			
	Henry Camarot Roger G. Connor Verne O. Martin Jay A. Rabinowitz William H. Sanders Arthur D. Talbot Warren A. Taylor George M. Yeager	Jay A. Rabinowitz Warren A. Taylor <i>Meeting Date 4/15/1960</i>	Jay A. Rabinowitz 1960 by Gov. William Egan
1962 - Anchorage Superior - J. Earl Cooper			
	Harold J. Butcher Clifford Groh Dorothy A. Haaland Peter J. Kalamarides Ralph E. Moody William H. Sanders	Clifford Groh Ralph E. Moody <i>Meeting Date 3/17/1962</i>	Ralph E. Moody 1962 by Gov. William Egan
1963 - Anchorage Superior - new position			
	Burton C. Biss Wayne D. Caldenwood Judge Hubert A. Gilbert R. Everett Harris Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz James K. Tallman William Taylor	Burton C. Biss Judge Hubert A. Gilbert <i>Meeting Date 5/23-24/1963</i>	Hubert A. Gilbert 1963 by Gov. William Egan
1963 - Nome Superior - Hubert A. Gilbert			
	Peter J. Kalamarides William H. Sanders L. Eugene Williams George T. Yates	William H. Sanders L. Eugene Williams George T. Yates <i>Meeting Date 10/17-18/1963</i>	William H. Sanders 1963 by Gov. William Egan
1965 - Fairbanks Superior - Jay A. Rabinowitz			
	Clyde C. Houston Eugene V. Miller Mary Alice Miller J.H. Shortell, Jr. Howard P. Staley Warren Wm. Taylor	Mary Alice Miller Eugene V. Miller Warren Wm. Taylor <i>Meeting Date 1/7-8/1965</i>	Warren Wm. Taylor 1965 by Gov. William Egan

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1965 - Supreme Court - Justice H. O. Arend			
	W.C. Arnold William V. Boggess Harold J. Butcher Judge Edward V. Davis Vernon D. Forbes Judge Ralph E. Moody Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz Arthur D. Talbot	W.C. Arnold William V. Boggess Judge Edward V. Davis Judge Ralph E. Moody Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz <i>Meeting Date 1/7-9/1965</i>	Jay A. Rabinowitz <i>2/21/65 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1966 - Juneau Superior - James A. von der Heydt			
	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. James R. Clouse, Jr. James E. Fisher Judge William H. Sanders Thomas B. Stewart J. Gerald Williams	Thomas B. Stewart J. Gerald Williams <i>Meeting Date 11/9-10/1966</i>	Thomas B. Stewart <i>1966 by Gov. Wm. A. Egan</i>
1967 - Anchorage Superior - Hubert A. Gilbert			
	James R. Clouse, Jr. Eben H. Lewis Robert N. Opland Judge William H. Sanders J. Gerald Williams	James R. Clouse, Jr. Eben H. Lewis J. Gerald Williams <i>Meeting Date 6/12/1967</i>	Eben H. Lewis <i>1967 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1967 - Anchorage Superior - new position			
	Harris R. Bullerwell Harold J. Butcher James R. Clouse, Jr. Duane K. Craske Dorothy A. Haaland Judge William H. Sanders J. Gerald Williams L. Eugene Williams Virgil D. Vochoska Verne O. Martin	Harold J. Butcher James R. Clouse, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 6/1-2/1967</i>	Harold J. Butcher <i>1967 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1967 - Ketchikan Superior - Walter E. Walsh			
	Harris R. Bullerwell Duane K. Craske Benjamin T. Delahay, Jr. Judge Hubert A. Gilbert Helen L. Simpson John M. Stern, Jr. Judge William H. Sanders	Duane K. Craske Judge Hubert A. Gilbert John M. Stern, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 12/5/1967</i>	Hubert A. Gilbert <i>1967 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1968 - Anchorage Superior - new position			
	James R. Clouse, Jr. Lloyd R. Duggar Verne O. Martin C.J. Occhipinti Judge William H. Sanders Karl L. Walter, Jr. George M. Yeager	C.J. Occhipinti Karl L. Walter, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 2/19-20/1968</i>	C.J. Occhipinti <i>1968 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1968 - Ketchikan District - new position			
	Keifer L. Gray William J. Hurley, Jr. Henry C. Keene, Jr. Irwin Ravin	Henry C. Keene, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 11/1/1968</i>	Henry C. Keene, Jr. <i>1968 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1968 - Bethel District - new position			
	Nora Guinn	Nora Guinn <i>Meeting Date 11/1/1968</i>	Nora Guinn <i>1968 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i> <i>Seat abolished 1976</i>
1969 - Public Defender			
	Victor D. Carlson Charles K. Cranston Stanley Ditus Marvin S. Frankel Johnston Jeffries Irwin Ravin Warren A. Taylor Harold W. Tobey Benjamin O. Walters, Jr.	Victor D. Carlson Marvin S. Frankel Harold W. Tobey <i>Meeting Date 6/20/1969</i>	Victor D. Carlson <i>1969 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Chief Justice - Buell A. Nesbett			
	Justice George F. Boney Justice John H. Dimond Judge C.J. Occhipinti	Justice George F. Boney Justice John H. Dimond <i>Meeting Date 4/3/1970</i>	Justice George F. Boney <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Supreme Court Justice - Buell Nesbett			
	Robert C. Erwin L.S. Kurtz, Jr. Judge Eben H. Lewis Judge C.J. Occhipinti Robert A. Parrish Judge William H. Sanders	Robert C. Erwin L.S. Kurtz, Jr. Judge Eben H. Lewis Robert A. Parrish <i>Meeting Date 6/18/1970</i>	Robert C. Erwin <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Sitka Superior - new position			
	Edmond W. Burke Victor D. Carlson Warren C. Christianson M. Ashley Dickerson Judge James A. Hanson Judge Henry C. Keene, Jr. James Nordale Thomas E. Schulz J.H. Shortell, Jr. James K. Singleton, Jr. Benjamin O. Walters, Jr.	Edmond W. Burke Victor D. Carlson Judge James A. Hanson Thomas E. Schulz James K. Singleton, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 9/16-19/1970</i>	Victor D. Carlson <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i> <i>Position transferred administratively to Juneau</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1970 - Fairbanks Superior - new position			
	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. Judge Victor D. Carlson Judge Hugh Connelly M. Ashley Dickerson Judge Mary Alice Miller James Nordale Judge William H. Sanders Thomas E. Schulz J.H. Shortell, Jr. James K. Singleton, Jr. Gerald van Hoomissen	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. Judge Victor D. Carlson Judge Mary Alice Miller James K. Singleton, Jr. Gerald van Hoomissen <i>Meeting Date 9/16-19/1970</i>	Gerald van Hoomissen <i>11/5/70 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Sitka District - Peter M. Page			
	Harris R. Bullerwell Roger W. DuBrock Edith A. Glennon Hal R. Horton John D. Mason Thomas B. Payne	Harris R. Bullerwell Roger W. DuBrock Hal R. Horton Thomas B. Payne <i>Meeting Date 11/9/1970</i>	Roger W. DuBrock <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i> <i>Seat abolished 1976</i>
1970 - Wrangell District - new position			
	Harris R. Bullerwell Roger W. DuBrock Edith A. Glennon Hal R. Horton John D. Mason Thomas B. Payne	Harris R. Bullerwell Roger W. DuBrock Hal R. Horton <i>Meeting Date 11/9/1970</i>	Harris R. Bullerwell <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Kodiak District - new position			
	Louis Agi Roger W. DuBrock Edith A. Glennon Hal R. Horton John D. Mason Thomas B. Payne	Roger W. DuBrock Hal R. Horton Thomas B. Payne <i>Meeting Date 11/9/1970</i>	Hal R. Horton <i>1970 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Anchorage District - James A. Hanson			
	Louis Agi Edith A. Glennon Hal R. Horton John D. Mason Thomas B. Payne William Tull Virgil D. Vochoska L. Eugene Williams	Hal R. Horton John D. Mason Virgil D. Vochoska L. Eugene Williams <i>Meeting Date 11/9/1970</i>	John D. Mason <i>12/7/70 by Gov. Keith Miller</i>
1970 - Public Defender 11/28/1970 Victor D. Carlson			
	Stanley Ditus Dick L. Madson Herbert D. Soll	Dick L. Madson Herbert D. Soll <i>Meeting Date 11/28/1970</i>	Herbert D. Soll <i>1970 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1971 - Supreme Court Justice - John H. Dimond			
	Robert Boochever Judge James M. Fitzgerald James Lack Roy H. Madsen	Robert Boochever Judge James M. Fitzgerald Roy H. Madsen <i>Meeting Date 12/16/1971</i>	Robert Boochever <i>1971 by Gov. William Egan</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1972 - Supreme Court Justice - George F. Boney			
	Edgar P. Boyko Judge James M. Fitzgerald Eugene V. Miller Judge Ralph E. Moody	Judge James M. Fitzgerald Judge Ralph E. Moody <i>Meeting Date 11/16/1972</i>	James M. Fitzgerald <i>12/31/72 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1972 - Kodiak District - Hal Horton (position moved to Anchorage in 1972)			
	Louis E. Agi Benjamin T. Delahay, Jr. Edith A. Glennon Thomas F. Keever Francis van T. Kernan Virgil D. Vochoska	Louis Agi Thomas F. Keever Francis van T. Kernan Virgil D. Vochoska <i>Meeting Date 7/8/1972</i>	Virgil D. Vochoska <i>1972 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1973 - Anchorage Superior - Edward V. Davis			
	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. Judge Paul B. Jones Peter J. Kalamarides	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. Peter J. Kalamarides <i>Meeting Date 2/15-17/1973</i>	Peter J. Kalamarides <i>1973 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1973 - Anchorage Superior - James M. Fitzgerald			
	Judge Joseph J. Brewer Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. William H. Fuld Dorothy A. Haaland Judge Paul B. Jones James C. Merbs Nissel A. Rose Judge William H. Sanders Andrew R. Sarisky Thomas E. Schulz Judge Dorothy D. Tyner Benjamin O. Walters, Jr.	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. Judge Paul B. Jones Judge William H. Sanders Thomas E. Schulz Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 5/3-4/1973</i>	Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr. <i>6/20/73 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1973 - Nome District - Maurice Kelliher			
	Benjamin T. Delahay, Jr. Jon Larson Thomas B. Payne Elmer C. Smith Ethan Windahl	Jon Larson Ethan Windahl <i>Meeting Date 8/21/1973</i>	Ethan Windahl <i>1973 by Gov. William Egan</i> <i>Seat abolished 1978</i>
1973 - Ketchikan Superior - Hubert A. Gilbert			
	Judge Roger W. DuBrock Thomas F. Keever A. Fred Miller Judge W. Bruce Monroe Thomas E. Schulz J. Gerald Williams	Judge Roger W. DuBrock Thomas E. Schulz J. Gerald Williams <i>Meeting Date 9/29/1973</i>	Thomas E. Schulz <i>11/16/73 by Gov. William Egan</i>
1975 - Fairbanks Superior - new position			
	James R. Blair Judge Hugh Connelly Judge Roger W. DuBrock Eugene V. Miller David J. Pree Judge Arthur L. Robson	James R. Blair Judge Hugh Connelly Judge Roger W. DuBrock <i>Meeting Date 1/11/1975</i>	James R. Blair <i>1/31/75 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Supreme Court Justice - James M. Fitzgerald			
	William V. Boggess Judge Edmond W. Burke	William V. Boggess Judge Edmond W. Burke <i>Meeting Date 2/12-13/1975</i>	Edmond W. Burke <i>4/4/75 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1975 - Anchorage District - Paul B. Jones			
	Alexander O. Bryner Gary W. Gantz Laurel Peterson	Alexander O. Bryner Gary W. Gantz Laurel Peterson <i>Meeting Date 2/12-13/1975</i>	Alexander O. Bryner <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Juneau District - W. Bruce Monroe			
	Richard A. Bradley Gerald O. Williams	Richard A. Bradley Gerald O. Williams <i>Meeting Date 4/1/1975</i>	Gerald O. Williams <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Wrangell District - Harris R. Bullerwell			
	Duane K. Craske George Gucker Francis van T. Kernan	Duane K. Craske George Gucker Francis van T. Kernan <i>Meeting Date 4/1/1975</i>	Duane K. Craske <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Public Defender - Herbert D. Soll			
	Douglas A. Fox Brian Shortell Herbert D. Soll Ronald T. West	Douglas A. Fox Brian Shortell Herbert D. Soll <i>Meeting Date 5/16/1975</i>	Brian Shortell <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Anchorage Superior - new position			
	Judge Victor D. Carlson Robert E. Hammond Richard P. Kerns David Pree J. Justin Ripley Helen L. Simpson Benjamin O. Walters, Jr.	Judge Victor D. Carlson Richard P. Kerns J. Justin Ripley Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 5/16/1975</i>	J. Justin Ripley <i>6/27/75 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Kodiak Superior - Edmond W. Burke			
	Roy H. Madsen Milton M. Souter	Roy H. Madsen Milton M. Souter <i>Meeting Date 8/20/1975</i>	Roy H. Madsen <i>9/17/75 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Fairbanks District - new position			
	Clay Berry Monroe Clayton Stephen R. Cline Francis van T. Kernan Edward Noonan	Monroe Clayton Stephen R. Cline <i>Meeting Date 8/22/1975</i>	Monroe Clayton <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Anchorage District - new position			
	Clay Berry Bruce Bookman Susan Burke Stanley Howitt Laurel Peterson Bruce Tennant	Susan Burke Laurel Peterson <i>Meeting Date 9/17/1975</i>	Laurel Peterson <i>1975 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1975 - Anchorage Superior - Harold J. Butcher			
	Russell E. Arnett Judge Victor D. Carlson Gary Gantz Karl Johnstone Richard Lytle James Merbs A.D. Talbot	Russell E. Arnett Judge Victor D. Carlson <i>Meeting Date 9/18/1975</i>	Victor D. Carlson <i>10/8/75 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1976 - Juneau Superior - new position			
	Linn H. Asper Joseph D. Balfe Allen T. Compton Judge Roger W. DuBrock James E. Fisher Gary W. Gantz	Joseph D. Balfe Allen T. Compton Judge Roger W. DuBrock <i>Meeting Date 1/8-9/1976</i>	Allen T. Compton <i>1976 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Valdez District - new position			
	John Bosshard, III James D. Ginotti Robin Taylor	John Bosshard, III James D. Ginotti Robin Taylor <i>Meeting Date 3/15/1976</i>	John Bosshard, III <i>1976 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Sitka Superior - Roger DuBrock (Former District Court Position)			
	Joseph D. Balfe Judge Alexander O. Bryner Donald L. Craddick Judge Duane K. Craske Edward Stahla	Judge Alexander O. Bryner Judge Duane K. Craske <i>Meeting Date 8/31/1976</i>	Duane K. Craske <i>9/24/76 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Fairbanks Superior - Everett W. Hepp			
	Judge Monroe Clayton Judge Hugh Connelly Jay Hodges	Judge Monroe Clayton Judge Hugh Connelly Jay Hodges <i>Meeting Date 9/23/1976</i>	Jay Hodges <i>9/28/76 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Bethel Superior - new position			
	Christopher Cooke Stephen Cooper James E. Fisher	Christopher Cooke Stephen Cooper <i>Meeting Date 10/18/1976</i>	Christopher Cooke <i>11/15/76 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Homer District - new position			
	James P. Doogan, Jr. Henry Holst James C. Hornaday Jack McGee Anita Remerowski David Walker	James P. Doogan, Jr. James C. Hornaday <i>Meeting Date 10/18/1976</i>	James C. Hornaday <i>11/2/76 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1976 - Wrangell District - Duane Craske			
	Robin Taylor Larry D. Wood	Robin Taylor Larry D. Wood <i>Meeting Date 12/13/1976</i>	Robin Taylor <i>1976 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i> <i>seat abolished 1982</i>
1977 - Anchorage Superior - Eben H. Lewis			
	Judge Alexander O. Bryner Denis Lazarus Mark C. Rowland Judge Thomas E. Schulz Gary Thurlow	Judge Alexander O. Bryner Mark C. Rowland Judge Thomas E. Schulz <i>Meeting Date 2/1-2/1977</i>	Mark C. Rowland <i>2/22/77 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1977 - Supreme Court Justice - Robert C. Erwin			
	William V. Boggess Warren Matthews Judge Ralph Moody Daniel A. Moore, Jr. William G. Ruddy Judge James K. Singleton, Jr.	William V. Boggess Warren Matthews Daniel A. Moore, Jr. William G. Ruddy Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 4/14/1977</i>	Warren Matthews <i>5/26/77 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1977 - Anchorage District - Dorothy D. Tyner			
	Glen C. Anderson William D. Cook Beverly W. Cutler Richard Lytle James Wolf	Glen C. Anderson William D. Cook Beverly Cutler <i>Meeting Date 6/29/1977</i>	Beverly W. Cutler <i>1977 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1977 - Anchorage Superior - C. J. Occhipinti			
	Bruce A. Bookman William Erwin William H. Fuld Eugene Murphy Milton M. Souter Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. Richard Weinig	Bruce A. Bookman William H. Fuld Milton M. Souter Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 12/14/1977</i>	Milton M. Souter <i>1/23/78 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1977 - Fairbanks District - Arthur L. Robson			
	Robert Blackford Stephen R. Cline Dallas L. Phillips L. Eugene Williams	Stephen R. Cline Dallas L. Phillips L. Eugene Williams <i>Meeting Date 12/14/1977</i>	Stephen R. Cline <i>1977 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1978 - Anchorage District - Alexander O. Bryner			
	Glen C. Anderson Joseph Evans John Strachan Richard Tennant L. Eugene Williams Ethan Windahl	Glen C. Anderson L. Eugene Williams Ethan Windahl <i>Meeting Date 12/10/1978</i>	Glen C. Anderson <i>3/16/78 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1979 - Anchorage Superior Peter J. Kalamarides			
	Albert Branson Robert Bundy Harland Davis LeRoy DeVeaux Sheila Gallagher Max Gruenberg Karl S. Johnstone Carolyn Jones Judge Laurel Peterson Arthur Robinson Douglas Serdahely Brian Shortell D. Ralph Stemp	Sheila Gallagher Karl S. Johnstone Douglas J. Serdahely Brian Shortell <i>Meeting Date 9/17/1979</i>	Karl S. Johnstone <i>10/8/79 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1979 - Anchorage District - Laurel Peterson			
	Charles R. Avery James Bendell Robert Frenz Lucy Lowden Donald Starks Elaine Vondrasek George Weiss L. Eugene Williams	Charles R. Avery L. Eugene Williams <i>Meeting Date 9/17/1979</i>	Charles R. Avery <i>1979 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Kotzebue Superior - new position			
	Tim MacMillan Marlin Smith Richard Whittaker	 <i>Meeting Date 11/9/1979</i>	*No names forwarded to the Governor because two applicants were not nominated. See 3/20/1980 meeting date.

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1980 - Kotzebue Superior <i>new position readvertised from 11/9/79</i>			
	William D. Cook Paul B. Jones Irwin Ravin Edward Welch Richard J. Whittaker	Paul B. Jones Richard J. Whittaker <i>Meeting Date 3/20/1980</i>	Paul B. Jones <i>5/5/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Court of Appeals - 3 new positions			
	Susan A. Burke Alexander O. Bryner Robert G. Coats Judge James A. Hanson Daniel Hickey Thomas F. Keever Judge Roy H. Madsen Charles Merriner Peter A. Michalski Judge Ralph E. Moody Robert N. Opland A. Lee Peterson Judge Thomas E. Schulz Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. D. Ralph Stemp Judge Warren Wm. Taylor	Alexander O. Bryner Robert G. Coats Judge James A. Hanson Judge Roy H. Madsen Charles Merriner Ralph Moody A. Lee Peterson Judge Thomas E. Schulz Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 6/20/1980</i>	Alexander O. Bryner Robert G. Coats James K. Singleton, Jr. <i>7/30/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Fairbanks District - Monroe Clayton			
	Hershel Crutchfield Robert Downes Natalie Finn Jane F. Kauvar Christopher E. Zimmerman	Hershel Crutchfield Robert Downes Jane F. Kauvar <i>Meeting Date 9/15/1980</i>	Hershel Crutchfield <i>10/30/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Supreme Court Justice - Robert Boochever			
	Judge Victor D. Carlson Judge Allen T. Compton John Havelock Andrew Kleinfeld Arthur Peterson William G. Ruddy Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. Donna Willard	Judge Victor D. Carlson Judge Allen T. Compton Andrew Kleinfeld William G. Ruddy Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 11/1/1980</i>	Allen T. Compton <i>12/12/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Anchorage Superior - James K. Singleton and 2 new positions			
	Judge Glen C. Anderson Stephen C. Branchflower William Donohue Sheila Gallagher Cheri Jacobus Carolyn Jones William Mackey Daniel A. Moore, Jr. Eugene Murphy Arthur Robinson Douglas J. Serdahely Brian Shortell James Wanamaker	Judge Glen C. Anderson William Donohue Sheila Gallagher Carolyn Jones Daniel A. Moore, Jr. Douglas J. Serdahely Brian Shortell James Wanamaker <i>Meeting Date 11/1/1980</i>	Daniel A. Moore, Jr. Douglas J. Serdahely Brian Shortell (<i>Singleton's position</i>) <i>12/12/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>
1980 - Nome Superior - William H. Sanders			
	Judge Paul B. Jones Charles Tunley	Judge Paul B. Jones Charles Tunley <i>Meeting Date 11/1/1980</i>	Charles Tunley <i>12/12/80 by Gov. Jay Hammond</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1981 - Fairbanks District - Mary Alice Miller			
	Hershel Crutchfield Robert Downes Jane F. Kauvar Brett M. Wood Thomas F. Keever	Robert Downes Jane F. Kauvar <i>Meeting Date 1/23/1981</i>	Jane F. Kauvar 2/18/81 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1981 - Public Defender - Brian Shortell			
	David Berry Ben Esch Dana Fabe Rene J. Gonzalez Nancy Shaw Sue Ellen Tatter Roy V. Williams	Dana Fabe Rene J. Gonzalez Sue Ellen Tatter Roy V. Williams <i>Meeting Date 3/31/1981</i>	Dana Fabe 1981 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1981 - Juneau Superior - Allen T. Compton			
	Linn H. Asper Walter L. Carpeneti James Douglas Douglas L. Gregg Peter M. Page Rodger W. Pegues Richard Svobodny Judge Robin Taylor	Walter L. Carpeneti Douglas L. Gregg Peter M. Page Rodger W. Pegues Judge Robin Taylor <i>Meeting Date 4/28-29/1981</i>	Rodger W. Pegues 6/11/81 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1981 - Anchorage District - Charles R. Avery			
	Elaine Andrews Thomas R. Boedecker Stephanie Cole James V. Gould Brigitte McBride Jess Nicholas Robert Rehbock John Scukanec Arthur Talbot Ronald T. West James Wolf Thomas Turnbull	Elaine Andrews Stephanie Cole James V. Gould Jess Nicholas <i>Meeting Date 5/28-29/1981</i>	Elaine Andrews 6/11/81 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1981 - Kenai Superior - James Hanson			
	Charles Cranston Charles Merriner Timothy Rogers Andrew R. Sarisky	Charles Cranston Charles Merriner <i>Meeting Date 9/3/1981</i>	Charles Cranston 10/15/81 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1981 - Juneau Superior - Thomas Stewart			
	Walter L. Carpeneti Peter M. Page	Walter L. Carpeneti Peter M. Page <i>Meeting Date 9/28/1981</i>	Walter L. Carpeneti 10/15/81 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1982 - Palmer Superior - new position			
	Judge Glen C. Anderson Judge Beverly W. Cutler LeRoy DeVeaux Carolyn Jones Charles Merriner Sigurd Murphy Thomas J. Yerbich	Judge Glen C. Anderson Judge Beverly W. Cutler LeRoy DeVeaux <i>Meeting Date 9/3/1982</i>	Beverly W. Cutler 10/28/82 by Gov. Jay Hammond

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1982 - Barrow Superior - new position			
	Michael Jeffery Timothy Stearns	Michael Jeffery Timothy Stearns <i>Meeting Date 9/30/1982</i>	Michael Jeffery 10/28/82 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1982 - Wrangell Superior - new position			
	Richard Folta Judge Henry C. Keene, Jr. Dennis L. McCarty Robin Taylor	Judge Henry C. Keene, Jr. Robin Taylor <i>Meeting Date 9/30/1982</i>	Henry C. Keene, Jr. 11/10/82 by Gov. Jay Hammond
1983 - Ketchikan District - Henry C. Keene, Jr.			
	Barbara Blasco James Bruce Roger Carlson George Gucker Dennis L. McCarty Richard J. Whittaker	Barbara Blasco George Gucker <i>Meeting Date 2/15-16/1983</i>	George Gucker 3/31/83 by Gov. William Sheffield
1983 - Anchorage District - Joseph Brewer, Virgil Vochoska (Vochoska's position moved from Kodiak)			
	Allen Bailey Eugene Cyrus Natalie Finn William H. Fuld Eric Hanson Donald Johnson Eugene Murphy Linda O'Bannon Patrick Owen Edward Peterson Robert Rehbock Christine Schleuss Nancy Shaw John Sivertsen Elaine Vondrasek L. Eugene Williams James Wolf Richard L. Yospin	Natalie Finn William H. Fuld Eric Hanson Donald Johnson Eugene Murphy Patrick Owen Christine Schleuss L. Eugene Williams Richard L. Yospin <i>Meeting Date 2/15-16/1983</i>	Natalie Finn (Vochoska's position) William H. Fuld (Brewer's position) 3/31/83 by Gov. William Sheffield
1983 - Supreme Court Justice - Roger G. Connor			
	Judge Alexander O. Bryner William Donohue Karen Hunt Millard Ingraham Kenneth Jacobus Judge Paul B. Jones Andrew Kleinfeld Judge Daniel A. Moore, Jr. Sandra Saville (<i>withdrew</i>) Judge Douglas J. Serdahely Judge James K. Singleton, Jr. Michael Thomas Donna Willard	Millard Ingraham Andrew Kleinfeld Judge Daniel A. Moore, Jr. Michael Thomas <i>Meeting Date 5/26/1983</i>	Daniel A. Moore, Jr. 7/10/83 by Gov. William Sheffield

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1983 - Anchorage Superior - Daniel A. Moore, Jr.			
	Cynthia Christianson LeRoy DeVeaux William Erwin Gary W. Gantz William Greene Karen Hunt Joan M. Katz Suzanne Pestinger	LeRoy DeVeaux William Erwin Karen Hunt Joan M. Katz <i>Meeting Date 11/29/1983</i>	Karen Hunt <i>1/10/84 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Valdez Superior - new position			
	Judge John Bosshard, III Hal P. Gazaway (<i>withdrew</i>) Patrick Owen (<i>withdrew</i>) Gordon J. Tans	Judge John Bosshard, III Gordon J. Tans <i>Meeting Date 5/16/1984</i>	John Bosshard, III <i>5/29/84 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Juneau District - Gerald O. Williams			
	Linn H. Asper Margaret Peggy Berck Monte Lee Brice John R. Corso Donald L. Craddick David T. Walker Richard L. Yospin	Linn H. Asper Margaret Peggy Berck David T. Walker Richard L. Yospin <i>Meeting Date 5/16/1984</i>	Linn H. Asper <i>6/22/84 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Anchorage Superior - 2 new positions			
	Andrew M. Brown Edward G. Ted Burton William Erwin Gail Roy Fraties Judge William H. Fuld Rene J. Gonzalez James V. Gould Joan M. Katz Peter A. Michalski Melvin M. Stephens, II	Edward G. Burton Gail Roy Fraties Rene J. Gonzalez James V. Gould Joan M. Katz Peter A. Michalski <i>Meeting Date 9/25-26/1984</i>	Rene J. Gonzalez Joan M. Katz <i>11/8/84 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Anchorage District - Beverly W. Cutler, Warren A. Tucker and 2 new positions			
	Martha Beckwith Dennis P. Cummings John M. Eberhart Maryann E. Foley David P. Gorman Andy Hemenway Robert D. Lewis Connie J. Sipe (<i>withdrew</i>) D. Ralph Stemp Melvin M. Stephens, II David C. Stewart Michael N. White	Martha Beckwith Andy Hemenway D. Ralph Stemp David C. Stewart Michael N. White <i>Meeting Date 9/25-26/1984</i>	Martha Beckwith (<i>Cutler's position</i>) D. Ralph Stemp (<i>Tucker's position</i>) David C. Stewart Michael N. White <i>11/8/84 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Fairbanks District - Stephen R. Cline			
	Teresa L. Foster Michael P. McConahy Thomas A. Miller Randy M. Olsen Daniel T. Saluri Mark I. Wood Christopher E. Zimmerman	Michael P. McConahy Randy M. Olsen Mark I. Wood Christopher E. Zimmerman <i>Meeting Date 12/17/1984</i>	Christopher E. Zimmerman <i>2/1/85 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Nominated</i>	<i>Appointed</i>
1984 - Fairbanks Superior - Warren Wm. Taylor			
	Rita T. Allee James P. Doogan, Jr. Mary E. "Meg" Greene Judge Jane F. Kauvar Dick L. Madson Billie D. Murphree Richard D. Savell D. Rebecca Snow Larry D. Wood Christopher E. Zimmerman	Mary E. "Meg" Greene Dick L. Madson <i>Meeting Date 12/17/1984</i>	Mary E. "Meg" Greene <i>1/4/85 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1984 - Anchorage Superior - Ralph E. Moody			
	Edward G. Ted Burton Gail Roy Fraties Judge William H. Fuld Peter A. Michalski Eugene Murphy Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. Thomas J. Yerbich	Edward G. Ted Burton Peter A. Michalski Eugene Murphy Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. <i>Meeting Date 12/17/1984</i>	Peter A. Michalski <i>1/31/85 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1985 - Wrangell Superior - Henry C. Keene, Jr.			
	James L. Bruce John B. Gaguine (<i>withdrew</i>) Thomas M. Jahnke Dennis L. McCarty T.W. Patch Drew Peterson John Peterson (<i>withdrew</i>) David T. Walker	Thomas M. Jahnke Dennis L. McCarty David T. Walker <i>Meeting Date 3/27-28/1985</i>	Thomas M. Jahnke <i>5/11/85 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1986 - Bethel Superior - Christopher Cooke			
	Gail Roy Fraties James D. Ginotti L. Ben Hancock Laurie H. Otto Bryan E. Schuler Timothy H. Stearns	Gail Roy Fraties L. Ben Hancock Bryan E. Schuler <i>Meeting Date 4/7-8/1986</i>	Gail Roy Fraties <i>5/22/86 by Gov. William Sheffield</i>
1987 - Fairbanks Superior - Gerald Van Hoomisen			
	Gary Foster Paul R. Lyle (<i>withdrew</i>) Dick L. Madson (<i>withdrew</i>) Richard D. Savell D. Rebecca Snow Niesje J. Steinkruger Patrick J. Travers Larry C. Zervos Judge Christopher E. Zimmerman	Richard D. Savell D. Rebecca Snow Judge Christopher E. Zimmerman <i>Meeting Date 3/20/1987</i>	Richard D. Savell <i>4/27/87 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>
1987 - Palmer District - new position			
	Peter G. Ashman Dennis P. Cummings John Thomas Maltas Daniel Weber Mark I. Wood	Peter G. Ashman Mark I. Wood <i>Meeting Date 6/20/1987</i>	Peter G. Ashman <i>7/31/87 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>

<p style="text-align: center;">Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present</p>			
	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Nominated</i>	<i>Appointed</i>
1989 - Anchorage Superior - Douglas Serdahely			
	Terry Aglietti Jacob Allmaras Judge Glen Anderson Don Bauermeister Dan Dennis William Donohue Phillip Eide Judge William Fuld David Mannheimer Nelson Page John Reese Judge David Stewart Benjamin O. Walters, Jr. Larry Wood	Glen Anderson David Mannheimer Nelson Page John Reese David Stewart <i>Meeting Date 5/8/1989</i>	<p>John Reese 6/26/89 by Gov. Steve Cowper</p>
1989 - Juneau District - Linn H. Asper			
	Margaret Berck Monte Brice Pat Conheady Peter Froehlich David Ingram Stephen Pearson David Walker	Margaret Berck Peter Froehlich <i>Meeting Date 5/9/1989</i>	<p>Peter Froehlich 6/26/89 Gov. Steve Cowper</p>
1989 - Bethel Superior - Gail Roy Fraties			
	Dale O. Curda Lawrence Delay Jonathan Link Allison Mendel Joseph Slusser Richard Whittaker	Dale O. Curda Allison Mendel Jonathan Link <i>Meeting Date 11/20/1989</i>	<p>Dale O. Curda 12/15/89 by Gov. Steve Cowper</p>
1990 - Kenai Superior - new position			
	Thomas Boedeker Jonathan Link Peter Mysing Arthur S. Robinson Judge Michael Wolverton	Jonathan Link Arthur S. Robinson Judge Michael Wolverton <i>Meeting Date 6/5/1990</i>	<p>Jonathan Link 7/20/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</p>
1990 - Juneau Superior - Rodger Pegues			
	Judge Thomas M. Jahnke Margot O. Knuth Ronald W. Lorensen Richard A. Svobodny David T. Walker Larry R. Weeks	Judge Thomas M. Jahnke Margot O. Knuth Ronald W. Lorensen Larry R. Weeks <i>Meeting Date 6/25/1990</i>	<p>Larry R. Weeks 8/3/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</p>
1990 - Sitka Superior - Duane Craske			
	Daniel W. Allan (<i>withdrew</i>) Cynthia P. Christianson (<i>withdrew</i>) Theron J. Cole Jonathan H. Link (<i>withdrew</i>) Dennis L. McCarty William E. Olmstead J. Michael Robbins Elizabeth L. Shaw Edward A. Stahla Judge Larry C. Zervos	Elizabeth L. Shaw Judge Larry C. Zervos <i>Meeting Date 8/6/1990</i>	<p>Larry C. Zervos 9/14/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</p>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1990 - Court of Appeals - James Singleton			
	Judge Glen C. Anderson David Mannheimer Susan Orlansky	Judge Glen C. Anderson David Mannheimer Susan Orlansky <i>Meeting Date 8/26/1990</i>	David Mannheimer <i>10/11/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>
1990 - Fairbanks District - Christopher Zimmerman			
	Teresa Foster Brimmer Robert B. Downes Raymond Funk Charles R. Pengilly Fleur Louise Roberts Wm. Ronald Smith	Teresa Foster Brimmer Raymond Funk Charles R. Pengilly <i>Meeting Date 8/27/1990</i>	Charles R. Pengilly <i>9/27/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>
1990 - Kodiak Superior - Roy Madsen			
	L. Ben Hancock Donald D. Hopwood Craig S. Howard Carolyn E. Jones Susan S. McLean Anna M. Moran T.W. Patch J. Michael Robbins (<i>withdrew</i>)	Donald D. Hopwood Carolyn E. Jones Susan S. McLean <i>Meeting Date 11/18/1990</i>	Donald D. Hopwood <i>11/30/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>
1990 - Homer District - James C. Hornaday			
	Lynn H. Christensen Thomas H. Dahl Ronald W. Drathman Monte Engel (<i>withdrew</i>) Virginia Marie Espenshade James A. Farr Donald D. Hopwood Carolyn E. Jones M. Francis Neville Fate Putman (<i>withdrew</i>) J. Michael Robbins (<i>withdrew</i>) Daniel William Westerburg	Lynn H. Christensen Donald D. Hopwood Carolyn E. Jones M. Francis Neville Daniel William Westerburg <i>Meeting Date 11/19/1990</i>	M. Francis Neville <i>11/30/90 by Gov. Steve Cowper</i>
1991 - Anchorage District - David Stewart			
	Louis E. Agi Dennis Cummings Steven D. DeVries James A. Farr Carolyn E. Jones Charlene Lichtmann (<i>withdrew</i>) John R. Lohff Kevin F. McCoy Gregory J. Motyka James Ottinger John A. Scukanec Benjamin O. Walters, Jr.	Carolyn E. Jones John R. Lohff Kevin F. McCoy <i>Meeting Date 1/20-21/1991</i>	John R. Lohff <i>3/8/91 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1991 - Anchorage Superior - Victor D. Carlson			
	Judge Glen C. Anderson Judge Elaine M. Andrews Bruce A. Bookman Stephen E. Branchflower Robert D. Frenz Kenneth P. Jacobus Thom F. Janidlo Carolyn E. Jones John R. Lohff J. Frank Prewitt, Jr. Richard Brock Shamberg James T. Stanley Richard J. Willoughby Judge Michael Wolverton Larry D. Wood	Judge Glen C. Anderson Judge Elaine M. Andrews Bruce A. Bookman Judge Michael Wolverton <i>Meeting Date 1/21-22/1991</i>	Elaine M. Andrews <i>3/8/91 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1991 - Kotzebue Superior - Paul B. Jones			
	Richard H. Erlich James A. Farr Gayle L. Garrigues Eric Smith Janna Stewart (<i>withdrew</i>)	Richard Erlich Eric Smith <i>Meeting Date 2/8/1991</i>	Richard H. Erlich <i>3/8/91 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1991 - Anchorage District - Elaine Andrews			
	Louis E. Agi Lynn H. Christensen Carolyn E. Jones Richard D. Kibby Michael L. Lindeman Kevin F. McCoy Gregory J. Motyka J. Frank Prewitt, Jr. Rhonda Butterfield Roberson John A. Scukanec William Jay Soule Susan M. Williams	Lynn H. Christensen Carolyn E. Jones Michael L. Lindeman Kevin F. McCoy Gregory J. Motyka <i>Meeting Date 6/9 -10/1991</i>	Gregory J. Motyka <i>7/26/91 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1991 - Valdez Superior - John Bosshard			
	Judge Glen C. Anderson Bill Cook Kenneth D. Lougee Michael J. Walleri	Judge Glen C. Anderson Kenneth D. Lougee <i>Meeting Date 10/11/1991</i>	Glen C. Anderson <i>11/26/91 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1993 - Anchorage District - Martha Beckwith			
	Ella Anagick Judge Peter G. Ashman Jeffrey A. Friedman Walter H. Garretson (<i>withdrew</i>) Laurence Keys Lisa B. Nelson John A. Scukanec Thomas R. Tatka Kneeland Taylor Stephen J. Van Goor James N. Wanamaker	Judge Peter G. Ashman Lisa B. Nelson John A. Scukanec Stephen J. Van Goor James N. Wanamaker <i>Meeting Date 6/27-29/1993</i>	James N. Wanamaker <i>8/13/93 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1993 - Anchorage Superior - J. Justin Ripley			
	Judge Peter G. Ashman Allen M. Bailey Stephen E. Branchflower Larry D. Card Walter H. Garretson William W. Garrison Cheri Christine Moore Jacobus Michael Jungreis Marilyn Jane Kamm Elizabeth "Pat" Kennedy (<i>withdrew</i>) J. L. McCarrey, III Brant McGee Judge James N. Wanamaker Judge Michael L. Wolverton	Judge Peter G. Ashman Larry D. Card Brant McGee Judge Michael L. Wolverton <i>Meeting Date 6/27-29/1993</i>	Larry D. Card <i>8/13/93 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1994 - Supreme Court - Edmond Burke			
	James R. Blair Robert E. Congdon Robert L. Eastaugh Cynthia M. Hora Judge Karen L. Hunt Judge Thomas M. Jahnke William K. Jermain Douglas D. Lottridge Judge Peter A. Michalski Joseph J. Perkins, Jr. Hugh G. Jerry Wade Donna C. Willard	Robert L. Eastaugh Judge Karen L. Hunt Judge Thomas M. Jahnke Hugh G. Jerry Wade Donna C. Willard <i>Meeting Date 1/9-10/1994</i>	Robert L. Eastaugh <i>1/29/94 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>
1994 - Anchorage District - John D. Mason			
	Jacob H. Allmaras Ella Anagick Judge Peter G. Ashman Julie E. Bryant Carmen E. ClarkWeeks Walter H. Garretson Gary M. Guarino Thom F. Janidlo Stephanie E. Joannides Stephen F. McKee Lisa B. Nelson T. W. Patch (<i>withdrew</i>) John A. Scukanec Stephen J. Van Goor	Judge Peter G. Ashman Stephanie E. Joannides John A. Scukanec Stephen J. Van Goor <i>Meeting Date 9/25-26/1994</i>	Stephanie E. Joannides <i>10/28/94 by Gov. Walter Hickel</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1995 - Ketchikan District - George L. Gucker			
	Linn H. Asper William J. Bonner Donald M. Bullock, Jr. Teresa R. Chenhall Patricia A. Collins David D. Mallet Trevor N. Stephens Susan E. Thomsen (<i>withdrew</i>) Stephen R. West	Linn H. Asper Teresa R. Chenhall Patricia A. Collins Trevor N. Stephens Stephen R. West <i>Meeting Date 5/14-15/1995</i>	Patricia A. Collins <i>7/7/95 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Supreme Court - Daniel A. Moore, Jr.			
	Judge Alexander O. Bryner Judge Beverly W. Cutler Judge Dana A. Fabe Judge Karen L. Hunt Donna C. Willard	Judge Alexander O. Bryner Judge Beverly W. Cutler Judge Dana A. Fabe Judge Karen L. Hunt Donna C. Willard <i>Meeting Date 1/7/1996</i>	Dana A. Fabe <i>1/26/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Nome Superior - Charles R. Tunley			
	James J. Benedetto Ben Esch Geoffry B. Wildridge	Ben Esch Geoffry B. Wildridge <i>Meeting Date 1/8/1996</i>	Ben Esch <i>2/16/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Kenai Superior - Charles K. Cranston			
	Allan D. Beiswenger (<i>withdrew</i>) Harold M. Brown Daniel R. Cooper, Jr. Gordon G. Goodman Sharon A.S. Illsley Ronald K. Melvin Paul E. Olson	Harold M. Brown Paul E. Olson <i>Meeting Date 3/2-3/1996</i>	Harold M. Brown <i>4/8/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Palmer Superior - Glen Anderson (position moved from Valdez)			
	David G. Berry Kenneth J. Goldman Robert Herz Sharon A.S. Illsley Ronald K. Melvin Phil N. Nash (<i>withdrew</i>) Paul E. Olson Eric Smith John L. Steiner David Stewart Dana Robert Stoker Thomas J. Yerbich	David G. Berry Kenneth J. Goldman Paul E. Olson Eric Smith David Stewart <i>Meeting Date 3/4-5/1996</i>	Eric Smith <i>4/18/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Valdez District - new position			
	James J. Benedetto Dennis Cummings Sharon A.S. Illsley (<i>withdrew</i>)	<i>No nominations</i> <i>Meeting Date 3/4-5/1996</i>	

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1996 - Anchorage Superior - Dana A. Fabe			
	Judge Peter G. Ashman Kari L. Bazzy Garber Marshall K. Coryell John E. Jack Duggan Sharon L. Gleason Mary Anne Henry Dan A. Hensley Elizabeth "Pat" Kennedy Brant McGee Judge Sigurd E. Murphy William B. Oberly (<i>withdrew</i>) Nelson G. Page Eric Sanders Nancy Shaw (<i>withdrew</i>) Judge Michael L. Wolverton Gary A. Zipkin (<i>withdrew</i>)	Judge Peter G. Ashman Sharon L. Gleason Dan A. Hensley Brant McGee Nelson G. Page Eric Sanders Judge Michael L. Wolverton <i>Meeting Date 6/24-26/1996</i>	Eric Sanders <i>8/8/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Chief Administrative Law Judge - new position			
	Brian Rudolph Bove Michael P. Breton Donald M. Bullock, Jr. Barbara Herman Shelley Higgins Theresa Hillhouse Randall James Moen Stephen J. Pearson	Michael P. Breton Barbara Herman Shelley Higgins <i>Meeting Date 10/14/1996</i>	Shelley Higgins <i>11/27/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1996 - Dillingham Superior - new position			
	Mark Figura L. Ben Hancock Michael Jungreis Kenneth Kirk (<i>withdrew</i>) Ray Plummer, Jr. David Baldwin Snyder Dana Robert Stoker (<i>withdrew</i>) Fred Torrasi	David Baldwin Snyder Fred Torrasi <i>Meeting Date 10/13/1996</i>	Fred Torrasi <i>11/27/96 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1997 - Court of Appeals - Alexander O. Bryner			
	Rene J. Gonzalez (<i>withdrew</i>) Sigurd Murphy Charles R. Pengilly David Stewart Mark I. Wood	Charles R. Pengilly David Stewart Mark I. Wood <i>Meeting Date 5/19-21/1997</i>	David Stewart 6/25/97 by Gov. Tony Knowles
1997 - Palmer District - Peter G. Ashman (<i>Ashman moved to Michael Wolverton's Anchorage District Court vacated position</i>)			
	Jacob H. Allmaras James J. Benedetto David G. Berry Joel H. Bolger William L. Estelle Ronald Paul Hemby (<i>withdrew</i>) Robert Herz Roger E. Holl (<i>withdrew</i>) Donald R. Kitchen Suzanne Lombardi Scott A. Sterling Vanessa H. White David L. Zwink	Jacob H. Allmaras David G. Berry Joel H. Bolger Suzanne Lombardi David L. Zwink <i>Meeting Date 5/19-21/1997</i>	Suzanne Lombardi 7/3/97 by Gov. Tony Knowles
1997 - Valdez District - new position created in 1995 (readvertised - see 3/4-5/1996 meeting)			
	James J. Benedetto Joel H. Bolger William J. Bonner Deborah K. Burlinski (<i>withdrew</i>) Leonard R. Devaney, III Gordon G. Goodman L. Ben Hancock Julie A. Smith Scott A. Sterling Mary P. Treiber Jennifer K. Wells	Joel H. Bolger William J. Bonner Mary P. Treiber Jennifer K. Wells <i>Meeting Date 5/19-21/1997</i>	Joel H. Bolger 7/3/97 by Gov. Tony Knowles
1997 - Fairbanks Superior - Jay Hodges			
	Daniel L. Callahan Scott Davis John Eberhart (<i>withdrew</i>) Raymond Funk Jane F. Kauvar Charles R. Pengilly Mark I. Wood Christopher E. Zimmerman	Daniel L. Callahan Raymond Funk Charles R. Pengilly Mark I. Wood <i>Meeting Date 9/22-23/1997</i>	Charles R. Pengilly 11/7/97 by Gov. Tony Knowles
1998 - Fairbanks District - Charles R. Pengilly			
	Katherine R. Bachelder J. John Franich Raymond Funk David F. Leonard Jeffrey O'Bryant Albert G. Parrish	J. John Franich Raymond Funk <i>Meeting Date 3/1998</i>	Raymond Funk 4/16/98 by Gov. Tony Knowles
1998 - Supreme Court - Allen T. Compton			
	Walter L. Bud Carpeneti Richard H. Erlich James A. Jamo Parrish Douglas J. Serdahely	Walter L. Bud Carpeneti Douglas J. Serdahely <i>Meeting Date 9/17/1998</i>	Walter L. Bud Carpeneti 11/4/98 by Gov. Tony Knowles

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
1999 - Juneau Superior - Walter L. Bud Carpeneti			
	Patricia A. Collins Ronald W. Lorensen Douglas K. Mertz Philip Pallenberg	Patricia A. Collins Ronald W. Lorensen <i>Meeting Date 2/12/1999</i>	Patricia A. Collins <i>3/27/99 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1999 - Anchorage District - William Fuld			
	Samuel D. Adams Jacob H. Allmaras Ronald L. Baird Carmen E. Clarkweeks Steven D. DeVries Dwayne W. McConnell Bruce Moore Nancy J. Nolan Paul E. Olson Stephen J. Van Goor David R. Weber (<i>withdrew</i>) James B. Wright (<i>withdrew</i>)	Samuel D. Adams Jacob H. Allmaras Nancy J. Nolan Paul E. Olson Stephen J. Van Goor <i>Meeting Date 7/19-20/1999</i>	Samuel D. Adams <i>9/2/99 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
1999 - Ketchikan District - Patricia A. Collins			
	Dennis L. McCarty Kevin G. Miller Edward A. Stahla Mary P. Treiber Stephen R. West	Kevin G. Miller Mary P. Treiber <i>Meeting Date 7/21-22/1999</i>	Kevin G. Miller <i>8/30/99 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
2000 - Anchorage Superior - Brian Shortell			
	Glenn E. Cravez John E. Jack Duggan Sharon L. Gleason Stephanie E. Joannides Allison E. Mendel Timothy G. Middleton Mark Rindner Craig J. Tillery	Sharon L. Gleason Stephanie E. Joannides Mark Rindner <i>Meeting Date 2/21-22/2000</i>	Stephanie E. Joannides <i>4/10/00 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
2000 - Ketchikan Superior - Thomas Jahnke			
	Scott A. Brandt-Erichsen Dwayne W. McConnell (<i>withdrew</i>) Sigurd E. Murphy Trevor Stephens Stephen R. West	Sigurd E. Murphy Trevor Stephens <i>Meeting Date 6/14-16/2000</i>	Trevor Stephens <i>7/31/00 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
2000 - Anchorage Superior - Karen Hunt			
	Kevin G. Clarkson (<i>withdrew</i>) Glenn E. Cravez Sharon L. Gleason Allison Mendel William F. Morse Lisa B. Nelson Susan A. Parkes Mark Rindner	Sharon L. Gleason William F. Morse Mark Rindner <i>Meeting Date 9/14/2000</i>	Mark Rindner <i>10/20/00 by Gov. Tony Knowles</i>
2000 - Anchorage District - Stephanie Joannides			
	Larry Cohn Patrick S. Hammers Ronald Melvin Vennie E. Nemecek John Richard	Larry Cohn <i>Meeting Date 9/15/2000</i>	No appointment *No names forwarded to the Governor because two applicants were not nominated. See 1/5-6/01 meeting date.

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2000 - Bethel District - new position			
	Gayle L. Garrigues Craig McMahon Margaret L. Murphy Chris Provost (<i>withdrew</i>)	Margaret Murphy <i>Meeting Date 9/16/2000</i>	No appointment *No names forwarded to the Governor because two applicants were not nominated. Upgraded to Superior Court, see Bethel 2002.
2001 - Anchorage Superior - Milton Souter			
	Sidney K. Billingslea Deidre S. Ganopole Sharon L. Gleason Allison Mendel (<i>withdrew</i>) William F. Morse Sigurd E. Murphy Lisa B. Nelson Susan A. Parkes Jack W. Smith	Sharon L. Gleason William F. Morse <i>Meeting Date 1/3-6/2001</i>	Sharon L. Gleason 2/19/01 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2001 - Anchorage District - Stephanie Joannides (readvertised from 9/15/2000)			
	Sharon Barr Elizabeth Brennan Connie L. Carson Larry Cohn Kimberlee A. Colbo Vincent Di Napoli Catherine M. Easter Deidre S. Ganopole Suzanne Lombardi Nancy J. Nolan John Richard Jack W. Smith Stephen J. Van Goor	Larry Cohn Nancy J. Nolan <i>Meeting Date 1/3-6/2001</i>	Nancy J. Nolan 2/19/01 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2001 - Anchorage Superior - new position			
	Peter G. Ashman Morgan Christen Matthew W. Claman Andrew Guidi Michael E. Kreger William F. Morse	Morgan Christen Andrew Guidi <i>Meeting Date 9/6/2001</i>	Morgan Christen 10/25/01 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2002 - Anchorage Superior - Rene J. Gonzalez			
	Peter C. Gamache (<i>withdrew</i>) Andrew Guidi Karen Jennings (<i>withdrew</i>) William F. Morse Sigurd E. Murphy Paul E. Olson Scott J. Nordstrand	Andrew Guidi William F. Morse Paul E. Olson <i>Meeting Date 1/11/2002</i>	William F. Morse 2/27/02 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2002 - Bethel Superior - new position			
	Bruce L. Brown Leonard R. Devaney, III Margaret L. Murphy Daniel Weber	Leonard R. Devaney, III Daniel Weber <i>Meeting Date 1/12/2002</i>	Leonard R. Devaney, III 2/27/02 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2002 - Fairbanks Superior - Ralph R. Beistline			
	Daniel L. Callahan Stephen C. Neil Slotnick Mark I. Wood	Daniel L. Callahan Mark I. Wood <i>Meeting Date 7/15/2002</i>	Mark I. Wood 8/30/02 by Gov. Tony Knowles

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2002 - Anchorage Superior - Eric Sanders, Elaine Andrews			
	Linda R. Beecher Sidney K. Billingslea Frederick H. Bonness Michaela Kelley Canterbury Matthew W. Claman Jonathon A. Katcher Kenneth Kirk <i>(withdrew)</i> John R. Lohff Sigurd E. Murphy Scott J. Nordstrand Paul E. Olson Susan A. Parkes <i>(withdrew)</i> J. Michael Robbins <i>(withdrew)</i> Jack W. Smith Michael T. Stehle <i>(withdrew)</i> Craig F. Stowers John Suddock Richard J. Todd Diane F. Vallentine Philip R. Volland Stephen B. Wallace Vanessa H. White <i>(withdrew)</i>	Sidney K. Billingslea Jonathon A. Katcher Paul E. Olson Craig Stowers John Suddock Philip R. Volland Meeting Date 9/29-10/1/2002	John Suddock Philip R. Volland 11/4/02 by Gov. Tony Knowles
2002 - Anchorage District - Peter G. Ashman, Natalie K. Finn			
	Ella Anagick <i>(withdrew)</i> Connie L. Carson Brian K. Clark Carmen E. Clark <i>(withdrew)</i> Suzanne R. Cole Leslie Dickson William Andrew Earnhart Catherine M. Easter Richard D. Kibby Vennie E. Nemecek Joseph D. O'Connell Paul E. Olson Phyllis A. Shepherd <i>(withdrew)</i> Jack W. Smith Linda Anna Webb <i>(withdrew)</i> Daniel Weber <i>(withdrew)</i> Jennifer K. Wells	Brian K. Clark Catherine M. Easter Paul E. Olson Jack W. Smith Jennifer K. Wells Meeting Date 12/4-6/2002	Brian K. Clark Jack W. Smith 1/23/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski
2003 - Fairbanks District - Mark I. Wood			
	Lori M. Bodwell Winston S. Burbank David V. Burglin <i>(withdrew)</i> Patrick S. Hammers Jeffrey O'Bryant Daniel Weber <i>(withdrew)</i>	Winston S. Burbank Jeffrey O'Bryant Meeting Date 3/14/2003	Winston S. Burbank 4/28/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski
2003 - Fairbanks Superior - Mary E. Greene			
	Lori M. Bodwell <i>(withdrew)</i> David V. Burglin <i>(withdrew)</i> J. John Franich Patrick S. Hammers <i>(withdrew)</i> Jeffrey O'Bryant Randy M. Olsen Karla Taylor-Welch Christopher E. Zimmerman	J. John Franich Randy M. Olsen Christopher E. Zimmerman Meeting Date 3/14/2003	Randy M. Olsen 4/28/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2003 - Palmer District - Suzanne H. Lombardi			
	Robert J. Collins William L. Estelle Charles T. Huguelet Karen L. Jennings Warren J. Kellicut (<i>withdrew</i>) Laurence Keyes Tara N. Logsdon J. Randall Luffberry (<i>withdrew</i>) Margaret L. Murphy Vennie E. Nemecek Joseph D. O'Connell Dennis Principe (<i>withdrew</i>) Verne Rupright (<i>withdrew</i>) Jennifer K. Wells	William L. Estelle Charles T. Huguelet Jennifer K. Wells <i>Meeting date 5/4-5/2003</i>	William L. Estelle 6/11/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski
2003 - Kodiak Superior - Donald D. Hopwood			
	Joel H. Bolger J. Michael Gray Charles T. Huguelet Sigurd E. Murphy Alan L. Schmitt Stephen B. Wallace	Joel H. Bolger Charles T. Huguelet Stephen B. Wallace <i>Meeting date 7/20-21/2003</i>	Joel H. Bolger 9/2/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski
2003 - Kenai Superior - Jonathan Link			
	Joel H. Bolger Charles T. Huguelet Richard D. Kibby (<i>withdrew</i>) Dwayne W. McConnell Sigurd E. Murphy Phil Nash (<i>withdrew</i>) Paul E. Olson (<i>withdrew</i>) Charles Allen Winegarden (<i>withdrew</i>)	Joel H. Bolger Charles T. Huguelet Dwayne W. McConnell <i>Meeting date 7/20-21/2003</i>	Charles T. Huguelet 9/2/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski
2003 - Palmer District - new position			
	David G. Berry Robert J. Collins John W. Erickson, Jr. Gregory Louis Heath Charles T. Huguelet (<i>Kenai Spr. Appt.</i>) Karen L. Jennings Jake Ketscher (<i>withdrew</i>) Laurence Keyes Margaret L. Murphy Joseph D. O'Connell (<i>withdrew</i>) Paul E. Olson Richard W. Postma (<i>withdrew</i>) Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells David L. Zwink	Gregory Louis Heath Laurence Keyes Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells <i>Meeting date 10/10-11/2003</i>	Gregory Louis Heath 11/25/03 by Gov. Frank Murkowski

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Nominated</i>	<i>Appointed</i>
2004 - Anchorage Superior - John Reese			
	Samuel D. Adams Sidney K. Billingslea Michael D. Corey Jonathon A. Katcher Scott J. Nordstrand Craig F. Stowers Stephen B. Wallace Diane L. Wendlandt Paul S. Wilcox	Sidney K. Billingslea Jonathon A. Katcher Craig F. Stowers <i>Meeting date 8/8-9/2004</i>	Craig F. Stowers <i>9/21/2004 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2004 - Kenai District - new position			
	Carol A. Brenckle (<i>withdrew</i>) Vince Curry Vincent Di Napoli Andy Hemenway (<i>withdrew</i>) David S. Landry Margaret L. Murphy John W. Wolfe	David S. Landry Margaret L. Murphy John W. Wolfe <i>Meeting date 10/7/2004</i>	David S. Landry <i>11/1/2004 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2004 - Palmer District - new position			
	Jeff Carney Vince Curry Vincent Di Napoli Rachel K. Gernat (<i>withdrew</i>) Andy Hemenway (<i>withdrew</i>) Laurence Keyes Tara Logsdon Margaret L. Murphy Chris Provost John W. Wolfe	Laurence Keyes Margaret L. Murphy Chris Provost John W. Wolfe <i>Meeting date 10/8/2004</i>	John W. Wolfe <i>11/1/2004 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2004 - Valdez District - Joel Bolger			
	Tim Oliver Cook Vincent Di Napoli Tena M. Foster Peter C. Gamache Andy Hemenway Margaret L. Murphy Paul A. Roetman Daniel Schally	Vincent Di Napoli Andy Hemenway Margaret L. Murphy Daniel Schally <i>Meeting date 12/5-9/2004</i>	Daniel Schally <i>1/17/2005 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2004 - Anchorage District - James Wanamaker			
	Eric A. Aarseth Connie L. Carson (<i>withdrew</i>) Carmen E. Clark Steven DeVries Tena M. Foster Pat Hanley Karen L. Hawkins Laurence Keyes Donald R. Kitchen Kari Kristiansen David Pease Stephen B. Wallace	Eric A. Aarseth Carmen E. Clark Steven DeVries Pat Hanley Donald R. Kitchen Kari Kristiansen <i>Meeting date 12/5-9/2004</i>	Pat Hanley <i>1/14/2005 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2004 - Juneau District - Peter Froehlich			
	Dan Branch Brad J. Brinkman James E. Douglas Doug Gardner (<i>withdrew</i>) Andy Hemenway Stacie L. Kraly Keith B. Levy Phillip M. Pallenberg	Brad J. Brinkman James E. Douglas Keith B. Levy Phillip M. Pallenberg <i>Meeting date 12/5-9/2004</i>	Keith B. Levy <i>1/24/2005 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2005 - Homer District - M. Francis Neville			
	J. John Franich Peter C. Gamache Darin B. Goff Patrick S. Hammers Andy Hemenway (<i>withdrew</i>) Margaret L. Murphy Phil N. Nash Daniel Schally (<i>appt. to Valdez Dist.</i>) Franklin E. Spaulding Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells	J. John Franich Darin B. Goff Margaret L. Murphy Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells <i>Meeting date 2/27-3/3/2005</i>	Margaret L. Murphy <i>4/20/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2005 - Fairbanks Superior - Richard D. Savell			
	Lori M. Bodwell Robert B. Downes Teresa L. Foster J. John Franich Joe Miller (<i>withdrew</i>) Franklin E. Spaulding	Lori M. Bodwell Robert B. Downes Teresa L. Foster J. John Franich <i>Meeting date 2/27-3/3/2005</i>	Robert B. Downes <i>4/20/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2005 - Anchorage District - Samuel D. Adams			
	Eric A. Aarseth Leonard R. Anderson Connie L. Carson (<i>withdrew</i>) Carmen E. Clark Steven DeVries Mary E. Fischer (<i>withdrew</i>) Peter C. Gamache Pat Hanley (<i>appt. to Anch. Dist. 1/05</i>) Karen L. Hawkins Laurence Keyes Donald R. Kitchen Kari Kristiansen Vennie E. Nemecek (<i>withdrew</i>) David Pease Alex M. Swiderski Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells	Eric A. Aarseth Carmen E. Clark Steven DeVries Donald R. Kitchen Kari Kristiansen Alex M. Swiderski Stephen B. Wallace Jennifer K. Wells <i>Meeting date 2/27-3/3/2005</i>	Alex M. Swiderski <i>4/11/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2005 - Alaska Public Defender - Public Defender term ended			
	Barbara K. Brink Brant McGee (<i>withdrew</i>) David D. Reineke Quinlan Steiner Linda Kay Wilson (<i>withdrew</i>)	Barbara K. Brink David D. Reineke (<i>withdrew</i>) Quinlan Steiner <i>Meeting date 9/14/2005</i>	Quinlan Steiner <i>10/14/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2005 - Anchorage Superior - Dan A. Hensley, Larry D. Card			
	Eric A. Aarseth Linda R. Beecher Kevin G. Clarkson Bill Cook Michael Corey Mary Anne Henry Thom F. Janidlo Jonathon A. Katcher Kari Kristiansen Patrick J. McKay Colleen J. Moore Sigurd E. Murphy Scott J. Nordstrand (<i>withdrew</i>) T.W. Patch David Pease (<i>withdrew</i>) Jack W. Smith	Eric A. Aarseth Linda R. Beecher Michael Corey Jonathon A. Katcher Kari Kristiansen Patrick J. McKay Jack W. Smith <i>Meeting date 10/14-15/2005</i>	Eric A. Aarseth Patrick J. McKay <i>11/30/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2005 - Bethel Superior - Dale O. Curda			
	Bruce L. Brown Bill Cook Dennis P. Cummings Brian Kay (<i>withdrew</i>) Chris Provost	Chris Provost <i>Meeting date 10/14-15/2005</i>	No appointment *No names forwarded to the Governor because two applicants were not nominated. See 4/06 meeting date.
2005 - Bethel District - new position			
	Bruce L. Brown Dennis P. Cummings Craig R. McMahon	Bruce L. Brown Dennis P. Cummings Craig R. McMahon <i>Meeting date 10/14-15/2005</i>	Dennis P. Cummings <i>11/30/05 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2006 - Fairbanks Superior - Charles R. Pengilly			
	Douglas L. Blankenship R. Poke Haffner Lynn E. Levengood Michael A. MacDonald William A. Spiers	Douglas L. Blankenship R. Poke Haffner Michael A. MacDonald <i>Meeting date 1/31/06</i>	Douglas L. Blankenship <i>3/10/06 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2006 - Bethel Superior - Dale O. Curda (readvertised)			
	Alicemary L. Closuit (<i>withdrew</i>) R. Poke Haffner	<i>No meeting</i>	Insufficient number of applicants. See 1/07 meeting.

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Nominated</i>	<i>Appointed</i>
2006 - Anchorage Superior - two new positions			
	David W. Baranow Linda R. Beecher Kevin G. Clarkson Michael Corey Craig S. Howard Mitchell Joyner (<i>withdrew</i>) Jonathon A. Katcher Kari Kristiansen Jack B. McGee Stephanie Galbraith Moore Chris Provost Jack W. Smith Gary Soberay (<i>withdrew</i>) Michael Spaan John L. Steiner Alex M. Swiderski Thomas Van Flein (<i>withdrew</i>) Stacy L. Walker (<i>withdrew</i>) Wayne E. Watson Stephen R. West Vanessa H. White David L. Zwink	Linda R. Beecher Michael Corey Jonathon A. Katcher Kari Kristiansen Chris Provost Jack W. Smith Michael Spaan <i>Meeting date 10/14-17/2006</i>	Jack W. Smith Michael Spaan <i>11/17/06 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2006 - Palmer Superior - two new positions			
	David W. Baranow Linda R. Beecher David V. Burglin Christopher C. Canterbury Jeff Carney Michael Corey Rachel K. Gernat Kenneth J. Goldman Craig S. Howard Karen L. Jennings (<i>withdrew</i>) Mitchell Joyner (<i>withdrew</i>) Kari Kristiansen Tara Logsdon Lachinski Rachel Levitt (<i>withdrew</i>) Jack B. McGee Chris Provost Jack W. Smith Gary Soberay (<i>withdrew</i>) Carmen K. Spiropoulos John L. Steiner Stacy L. Walker (<i>withdrew</i>) Wayne E. Watson Stephen R. West Vanessa H. White David L. Zwink	Linda R. Beecher Michael Corey Jonathon A. Katcher Kari Kristiansen Chris Provost Jack W. Smith Vanessa H. White <i>Meeting date 10/14-17/2006</i>	Kari Kristiansen Vanessa H. White <i>11/17/06 by Gov. Frank Murkowski</i>
2007 - Kenai Superior - new position			
	Sharon A.S. Illsley Dennis Patrick James Scot H. Leaders Lynn E. Levensgood Anna M. Moran Arthur "Chuck" Robinson	Anna M. Moran Arthur "Chuck" Robinson <i>Meeting date 1/17-18/2007</i>	

Historical Log of Judicial Appointments 1959-Present			
	Candidates	Nominated	Appointed
2007 - Bethel Superior - Dale O. Curda - (readvertised)			
	Ella Anagick R. Poke Haffner Marvin Charles Hamilton, III Dennis Patrick James	R. Poke Haffner Marvin Charles Hamilton, III <i>Meeting date 1/17-18/2007</i>	
2007 - Fairbanks Superior - new position			
	Aisha Tinker Bray R. Poke Haffner Bethany Spalding Harbison Jane F. Kauvar Michael A. MacDonald Michael P. McConahy Alicemary L. Rasley John J. Tiemessen		
2007 - Anchorage District - Jack Smith			
	Ella Anagick Nathaniel "Nick" Atwood Christopher C. Canterbury Suzanne R. Cole John M. Darnall Catherine M. Easter Rachel K. Gernat Patrick S. Hammers Dennis Patrick (Pat) James Richard W. Postma, Jr. Verne Edwin Rupright		
2007 - Kenai District - David Landry			
	Patrick S. Hammers Sharon A.S. Illsley Dennis Patrick (Pat) James Scot H. Leaders Joe Montague Anna M. Moran Paul A. Roetman Verne Edwin Rupright		

Deliberately left blank

Appendix F

Retention Evaluation Procedures

Deliberately left blank

Appendix F

Alaska Judicial Council Retention Evaluation Program

Alaska's constitution and statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate each judge standing for retention election, and to make its evaluations and any recommendations public prior to the election. The Judicial Council evaluates *pro tem* judges (retired judges sitting temporarily by order of the supreme court) at the request of the supreme court and may evaluate other judges. The supreme court also has asked the Council to conduct attorney and peace officer surveys of magistrates and masters. The procedures used by the Council, and the results of evaluations conducted since 1976, are outlined in the following paragraphs.

A. Retention Evaluation Procedures

The legislature first authorized retention evaluations in 1976. The evaluation procedures have evolved since that time into a thorough, objective review of each judge. Revisions in the process have focused on broadening the scope and effectiveness of the evaluations. The Council also has improved its communication of evaluation information and recommendations to voters.

The procedures fall into three general categories. The Council asks professionals to evaluate each judge. It surveys all Alaska Bar Association members, all active peace and probation officers, all social workers (for the first time in 1998), all guardian ad litem/CASA volunteers (for the first time in 1998), and all court employees (for the first time in 1996). The Council also sends questionnaires to selected attorneys who have had demonstrated experience before each judge, drawing from a list of trials and major cases submitted by the judge.

Second, the Council reviews materials specific to each judge. Each judge completes a questionnaire about work during the prior term. The Council also considers public documents including court case files, Alaska Public Offices Commission and court conflict-of-interest filings, Commission on Judicial Conduct public records, and information about cases including peremptory challenges to the judge, recusals, and affirmance/reversals by the appellate courts.

Public input is the third aspect of the evaluations. In 2006, this included public hearings at about twenty locations throughout the state, and newspaper ads encouraging public comment (both oral and written) during the evaluation period. Staff issued press releases to supplement the newspaper ads. Public input includes surveys of each juror who served in 2004 and 2005 with the judges up for retention in 2006. The Council also solicits comments about judges on its website at www.ajc.state.ak.us.

For the 2006 retention evaluations, the Council directly asked thousands of Alaskans, including various professionals, jurors and others for their evaluations of the judges. About 6,500 responded. The very high response rate confirmed strong interest in judicial performance.

The Council reviews all of the materials collected before meeting to make its final evaluation and recommendation. Members may interview one or more judges personally. (The Council interviewed six judges in 2006.) After the Council evaluates each judge and makes its recommendations, it publishes the results in newspapers throughout the state and in the Official Election Pamphlet prepared by the Lieutenant Governor. Detailed evaluation material, more than in any other jurisdiction, is available to voters on the Internet or in a written booklet.

1. Professional Evaluations

a. Surveys

The Council surveys all active and all in-state inactive members of the Alaska Bar Association, all peace and probation officers in the state who handle criminal cases, all social workers and all guardians ad litem/CASA volunteers. In 2006, the Council asked 3,036 attorneys, 1,492 peace and probation officers, and 347 social workers/guardians ad litem/CASA volunteers to evaluate the judges. About 39% of the attorneys, 30% of the peace and probation officers, and 28% of the social workers/guardians ad litem/CASA volunteers responded. Survey specialists consider these good response rates for mail surveys.

Bar members evaluate all judges and justices. Peace and probation officers, and social workers/guardians ad litem/CASA volunteers evaluate all trial court judges. The areas of evaluation for each judge include legal ability, impartiality, integrity, judicial temperament, diligence, and knowledge, and overall performance. The non-attorney professionals do not evaluate trial judges on legal abilities. The Council encourages respondents to add comments, based on their experience with each judge. (See Attachment A for a sample page.)

An independent contractor at the University of Alaska (BHRS) carries out the surveys for the Judicial Council, to assure objectivity in the findings. Most of the analysis uses only responses from those who reported direct professional experience with the judge being evaluated. Analysis considers the respondent's type of practice, location within the state, and other demographic variables.

In 2006 the Council surveyed 606 court employees (39% responded). The survey asked employees to use a 5-point scale to evaluate judges' treatment of staff and others, management abilities, diligence, integrity and overall performance. Court employees had space for comments. The Council also surveyed all jurors who served in trials before retention judges in 2004 and 2005 (2,623 jurors responded). The Judicial Council collected and tabulated the court employee survey and the juror survey.

Survey respondents are encouraged to sign their comments but are not required to do so. The Council shares survey comments with the judges after the comments are edited to preserve the anonymity of survey respondents. The Council shares survey scores with each judge before the Council's evaluation meeting and makes the final report available to the public and media throughout the state. Since 1996, survey results have been made available on the Internet (www.ajc.state.ak.us).

b. Counsel Questionnaires

Each judge gives the Judicial Council a list of three trials, three non-trial cases, and any other cases that the judge found significant during his or her most recent term in office. The Council asks all of the attorneys in each case to complete a brief questionnaire about the judge's fairness, legal abilities, temperament and administrative handling of the case. Most attorneys contacted return these questionnaires. Council members use these questionnaires as part of their final evaluations.

2. Judges' Materials

a. Judge's Questionnaire

Each judge fills out a short questionnaire about the types of cases handled during the previous term, legal or disciplinary matters the judge may have been involved in, and health matters that could affect the judge's ability to perform judicial duties. The questionnaire asks the judge to describe satisfaction with judicial work during the previous term. The judge can make any comments that would help the Council in its evaluations.

b. Other Records

Council staff review public records, including annual conflict-of-interest statements filed with the Alaska Public Offices Commission, separate conflict-of-interest forms filed with the court system, court case files, and Commission on Judicial Conduct public files. The Council also reviews performance-related court data, such as the number of peremptory challenges filed against a judge and the number of reversals on appeal. The Council scrutinizes performance-related data carefully, because the type of caseload or judge's location may play a major part in the numbers of challenges or appeals and reversals. These challenges may arise more from the local legal culture and the nature of the cases than from the judges' decisions.

c. Interviews

Any judge may request an interview with the Judicial Council. The Council, in turn, may ask judges to speak with the Council members during the final stages of the evaluation process. Judges may respond to concerns raised during the evaluation process by records or by persons commenting.

3. Public Input

The Council uses public hearings, juror surveys, and publicity to encourage the public to help evaluate judges.

a. Juror Surveys

The Council asks jurors who have sat on trials during the most recent years of a judge's term for their knowledge of the judge's performance. Jurors highlight different aspects of judicial performance than do professionals. Their role in a case gives them an objective perspective that may not be as easily available to others in the courtroom.

b. Public Hearings

Public hearings for all judges standing for retention were conducted throughout the state in 2006, using the legislature's teleconference network and public meeting rooms. Statewide newspaper ads encouraged citizens to comment. While juror surveys provide largely positive information about judicial performance, public hearings may attract persons who were less satisfied with judicial decisions. The two procedures give the Council the opportunity to view a range of opinions.

c. Other Publicity and Input

The Council publicized the evaluation process widely through frequent press releases and submission of feature articles to newspapers. In 2006, the Council asked for public comment on the Internet and received numerous responses. The Council incorporated the independent evaluations of Alaska Judicial Observers, a group of community-based volunteer court observers into its decisions.

4. Other Investigation

Council staff investigated specific cases, listened to court proceedings, and interviewed judges, attorneys, court staff, and others.

5. Dissemination of Results

By law, the Council must make its evaluations and recommendations public at least sixty days prior to the election. It also must submit materials to the Lieutenant Governor's Official Election Pamphlet. Attachment B includes sample materials. In 2006 the Council published newspaper ads with its recommendations and address for more detailed evaluations for several weeks before the election in twenty-two newspapers around the state. Each of the thirty-one judges had detailed evaluation information available on the Internet or in printed form. Press releases and news articles appeared statewide.

B. Historical Results of Evaluations

The Council has evaluated judges standing for retention since 1976 (see Attachment C for vote totals). In every election, the Council has found all or most of the judges qualified, and has recommended their retention. Voters retained all of the judges found qualified, most by substantial margins in most years. Vote analyses for all years since 1976 indicate that typically judges received from 60% to 70% "yes" votes in the Third Judicial District (which includes Anchorage, Palmer, the

Kenai Peninsula and Kodiak), and from 65% to 75% "yes" votes in the other judicial districts. The effects of the Council's recommendations, and of campaigns opposing judges, must be measured against the typical voting patterns.

1. Judges Found "Not Qualified"

The Council found one or two judges not qualified for retention in 1976, 1978, and 1980. All of the judges were district court judges. Both attorneys and peace officers evaluated each as "below acceptable" on most of the evaluation criteria, including legal ability and overall performance. The judges were retained, although by significantly lower vote totals than most judges in their districts.

In 1982, voters did not retain two district court judges found to be unqualified, giving them about 45% "yes" votes in each case. Reasons suggested for the difference between the 1982 election and prior elections included increasing reliance on Judicial Council recommendations as voters grew more familiar with them. A number of very controversial ballot issues in 1982 may have generated more general interest in the elections. Low "yes" vote totals for all judges in the Third Judicial District in 1982 may have been correlated with a minority of "yes" votes for the two judges found unqualified by the Council.

During the years 1984 through 2004, the Council found all but one judge qualified. Voters retained all in office. The one unqualified judge was a superior court judge who stood for retention in 1988. The judge had received "below acceptable" ratings from attorneys on integrity, impartiality, temperament and overall performance. Peace officers also rated the judge "below acceptable" on several qualities. The Council based its finding of "unqualified" on these survey ratings and other information brought to its attention. The Council publicized the judge's survey scores but did not publicize the source or nature of the particular other concerns that contributed to the Council's recommendation against the retention of the judge. Voters retained the judge, although with significantly fewer "yes" votes than typical for that year.

In 2006 the Council found a district court judge unqualified and recommended against the retention of the judge. Voters did not retain the judge, giving him 47% "yes" votes. The judge found to be unqualified was rated "acceptable" or better in Council surveys. However, the Council received a number of critical reports and comments from those who worked with and appeared before the judge. The Judicial Council undertook an additional investigation including a review of court records and interviews with over forty people. The investigation corroborated concerns that lead to the Council's recommendation against retention of the judge. The Council decided to publicize its particular concerns to allow the public to make an informed decision.

2. Campaigns Against Judges

Various groups have campaigned against judges in the past three decades. Most have not mounted their campaigns until shortly before the election. Opponents have noted that the Code of Judicial Conduct prohibits judges from campaigning until opposed. Canon 5C(2) of the Alaska Code of Judicial Conduct allows a judge who is a candidate for retention in judicial office to engage in limited political activity when there is active opposition to the judge's candidacy. Canon 5C(1)

allows judges to form an election committee to conduct an election campaign in case there is active opposition. Canon 5C(3) outlines the parameters for soliciting and spending campaign funds.

Opponents can prepare campaigns and raise funds well in advance, while judges cannot raise funds or advertise until after the first instance of public attack. Substantial campaigns against supreme court justices were waged in 1980, 1988 and in 2000. The justices were retained, but by lower margins than most other judges. In 1984, 1994, 2000 and to a lesser extent in the other years, groups and individuals conducted campaigns against some trial court judges. For the most part, they were not well-organized and had little effect on voters' actions. Campaigns against four trial court judges in 2000 did have a significant impact on vote totals.

3. Effectiveness of Council Evaluations

The Council has assessed the effectiveness of its evaluation process twice. It surveyed nearly 2,000 voters in 1979, and made a formal report. In 1990, students informally polled voters in exit surveys. In both surveys, some voters said that they always voted either for or against all judges. Others said they discriminated, voting "yes" for some judges and "no" on others, based on personal experience or information available to them. Those voters were more likely to say that they had read the Judicial Council's recommendations or had used them in their voting. In 1996, the American Judicature Society conducted an independent review of retention evaluation procedures in several states. AJS found the Council's evaluations effective for those who used them. AJS also found that judges with higher ratings from attorneys and peace and probation officers tended to get more "yes" votes.

In 2006, the Council voted to recommend thirty out of thirty-one judges on the ballot. Voters retained the judges recommended for retention but did not retain the judge who was not recommended for retention by the Council. Although some members of the public urged voters to not retain some judges recommended for retention by the Council, the opposition did not appear to have much effect on vote totals. These circumstances confirmed that the public values Judicial Council recommendations.

Another example of the effectiveness of the Council's recommendations came from the 1992 elections. Although the Council found them qualified and recommended "yes" votes on each, two Third Judicial District judges were rated below the other judges. No group campaigned against these judges, but they received substantially fewer votes than the other judges on the ballot. The voting results suggest that many voters used the Council's information in the Official Election Pamphlet to make their own decisions about how to vote.

Observers have occasionally suggested that the relatively low percentage of judges against whom the Council recommends, and the even lower percentage of judges rejected by the voters, shows that Alaska's retention election system does not work. The Council believes that it demonstrates the quality of both Alaska's non-political merit selection system for judges, and of Alaska's judiciary.

Another factor not immediately obvious is that a significant number of judges choose to retire rather than stand for retention. For example in 1990, twenty-two judges were eligible to stand

for retention. Seven of these judges took themselves off the ballot voluntarily. While these decisions had little to do with the retention election and the Council's evaluation in the majority of cases, such factors probably do play a part in judges' decisions to retire in a few cases.

In addition, the comprehensive evaluations conducted by the Council, especially in recent years, coupled with the prior recommendations against retention, provide a strong incentive for judges to do their best. For example, the judge recommended against in 1988 (but retained by the voters) significantly improved his performance in his next term as reflected in his Bar and peace officer ratings.

C. Other Judicial Evaluations

The Council has conducted other types of judicial performance evaluation.

1. Pro Tem Judge Evaluations

The supreme court has required Council evaluations of *pro tem* judges by court rule (Administrative Rule 23) since 1987. Most *pro tem* judges are retired superior court judges who serve for a few days or as much as a few months per year. The Council surveys Bar members about the judges. The Council sends its evaluations to the Chief Justice, who combines them with presiding judges' evaluations and other materials to decide whether judges should continue to serve *pro tem* for another two-year term. The first judges were evaluated in 1988, and a second group of four was evaluated in 1990. Six judges were evaluated in 1992, twelve in 1994, eight in 1997, and five each in 2000, 2002, and 2004. In 2006, the Council evaluated twelve *pro tem* judges.

2. Master/Magistrate Surveys

The Alaska Supreme Court asked the Council to conduct attorney and peace officer surveys of four Anchorage standing masters in late 1997 to assist the courts in the evaluation of these judicial officers, to allow feedback for the judicial officers, and to allow attorneys and peace officers an opportunity to submit comments. The Council conducted an expanded survey that included more masters and added magistrates in 1999. In 2001, the Council surveyed all attorneys and peace officers about the performance of all of the magistrates and masters throughout the state. Survey results were provided to the Alaska Supreme Court, presiding judges, and to the magistrates and masters. The Council's next evaluation of Alaska's masters and magistrates will occur in early 2007.

Attachment A
(Sample Judicial Council retention survey form for attorneys)

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

SUPERIOR COURT

JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

Basis for Evaluation: Which of the following describes the basis for your evaluation of this judge? (Circle one or more.)

- 1 Direct professional experience
- 2 Professional reputation
- 3 Social contacts
- 9 Insufficient knowledge to evaluate this judge (Go on to next judge.)

To rate this judge, circle one number for each criterion. If you lack sufficient knowledge to rate the judge for any one of the criteria, circle 9. (See Page ii for definitions of the rating criteria and rating scale.)

	Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Insufficient Knowledge
1 Legal Ability	1	2	3	4	5	9
2 Impartiality/Fairness	1	2	3	4	5	9
3 Integrity	1	2	3	4	5	9
4 Judicial Temperament	1	2	3	4	5	9
5 Diligence	1	2	3	4	5	9
6 Overall evaluation of judge	1	2	3	4	5	9

Comments: See Introduction about the types of comments sought and to review Council policy on anonymity.

Add any additional comments on pages 32 ff.

Print Name (Optional)



Attachment B
(Sample voter pamphlet pages)
(General pages submitted by the Council)



Alaska Judicial Evaluation and Retention System
www.ajc.state.ak.us

Alaskans choose their judges through a merit selection system and vote every few years on whether to keep them on the bench. The system assures that judges remain non-partisan and accountable to the public. The constitution requires that the Alaska Judicial Council nominate only the best-qualified people to the Governor for appointment to judgeships, and the state laws require that the Judicial Council evaluate each judge standing for retention elections. State law also requires that the Judicial Council publish its evaluations in the Voters' Pamphlet. The evaluations of judges standing in the November 2006 election appear on the following pages. Each judge also may pay for a page of biographical information that he or she prepares.

Judicial Evaluation Procedures

The Alaska Judicial Council, a non-partisan citizens commission established by the Alaska constitution, evaluates judges on a number of criteria, including their legal ability, demeanor, their diligence, their ability to manage their caseloads, and their fairness and integrity. The Council evaluates judges with the help of thousands of Alaska citizens – police and probation officers, attorneys, jurors, court employees, social workers and others who appear in court before the judges. In 2006, the Council surveyed these groups, asked for written and oral comments from the public throughout the state, and reviewed records about judges' workloads, conflicts of interest, and other aspects of performance.

Summary of Alaska Judicial Council Recommendations - In 2006 the Judicial Council evaluated thirty-one trial court judges. The Judicial Council found that thirty judges were QUALIFIED and recommends that voters retain them as judges. The Council found that Judge David Landry was UNQUALIFIED and recommends that voters not retain him as a judge.

Surveys - The Judicial Council surveyed all active members of the Alaska Bar Association, and all peace and probation officers in the state. In 2006, the Council sent surveys to 3,036 attorneys and 1,492 peace and probation officers. An independent contractor handled the surveys for the Judicial Council, to assure objectivity in the findings. Questions on the surveys asked about judges' legal abilities, fairness, integrity, temperament, diligence and overall performance. Similar surveys went to social workers and citizens who participated in helping Alaska's children in court as guardians ad litem and Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers. The Council asked jurors who had served on cases with the judges to comment on the judges' abilities to handle the trials fairly and capably. Court employees also received surveys to rate the judges.

Judge and Counsel Questionnaires – Each judge standing for retention returned a self-evaluation questionnaire to the Judicial Council. The questionnaire included lists of recent cases that the judge believed were important for evaluation, with an emphasis on jury and non-jury trials. The Council asked each attorney in each case to fill out an additional survey about the judge's performance in that particular case, including detailed comments about the judge's abilities.

Other Records - Council staff reviewed a series of other public records, including conflict of interest annual statements filed with the Alaska Public Offices Commission and separate forms filed with the court system; court case files; Commission on Judicial Conduct public files; and a report on any withheld salary warrants. The Council also reviewed performance related court data, such as the number of peremptory challenges filed against a judge and the number of reversals on appeal. The Council looked at performance related data carefully, because a judge's caseload type or location may play a major part in the numbers of challenges or appeals and reversals. For example, an Anchorage judge assigned 800 civil cases in one year may receive more challenges (and possibly more appellate reversals) than a rural area judge assigned a mixed caseload of 500 civil and criminal cases. The Alaska Judicial Observers, an independent group of community-based volunteer court observers, provided information to the Council about the retention judges in Anchorage, Kenai and Palmer who they had evaluated.

Public Hearings and Comment - The Council held statewide public hearings for all judges standing for retention, using the legislature's teleconference network and public meeting rooms. Statewide newspaper ads encouraged public participation. Public hearings give citizens a valuable opportunity to speak out about their experiences with judges. They also provide a forum in which citizens can hear the opinions of others.

Investigation - Council staff investigated specific cases, listened to court proceedings, and interviewed judges, attorneys, court staff, and others.

Other Publicity and Input - The Council widely publicized the evaluation process. The Council solicited comments about judges on its website. The Council balanced all the information it received from its many sources.

Results of Evaluations

Evaluation information for each retention judge appears on the following pages. Summaries of the attorney, peace and probation officer, juror, social worker and court employee survey scores are provided. The Alaska Judicial Observers evaluation, where available, also is summarized. Summaries of survey results are shown in tables. Survey ratings are on a five-point scale with "5" as the highest score, "1" as the least favorable score, and "3" as acceptable. The Council's Internet web pages contain survey results and performance information about each judge on the ballot this fall. (<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>)

Judicial Council Members

Alaska's constitution establishes the membership of the Judicial Council as three non-attorney members appointed by the Governor, three attorney members appointed by the Board of Governors of the Alaska Bar Association, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alaska who serves, ex officio, as chair. (The Chief Justice only votes when his or her vote can affect an outcome.) The Constitution provides that all appointments be made with "due consideration to area representation and without regard to political affiliation." A majority of both houses of the Legislature must confirm the non-attorney appointments, while the Board of Governors of the Alaska Bar Association appoints the attorney members after conducting advisory elections among Bar members within local judicial districts. Members serve six-year staggered terms. They receive no financial compensation for their work other than reimbursement for travel expenses.

Alex Bryner was chair of the Judicial Council when the Council conducted its evaluation and made its retention recommendations, by virtue of his position as Chief Justice of the Alaska Supreme Court. Justice Bryner was appointed to the supreme court in 1997. Before his appointment, he had served as Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, U.S. Attorney, and an Anchorage District Court judge. (Term: 2003 - 2006) Dana Fabe is the current Chief Justice and chair of the Judicial Council. Justice Fabe was appointed to the supreme court in 1996. Before her appointment she served as a superior court judge. (Term: 2006 - 2009)

Eleanor Andrews is a non-attorney member of the Council from Anchorage. She has served as commissioner of the Department of Administration under Governor Sheffield, and employee relations director for the Municipality of Anchorage. Since 1987 she has been owner and CEO of Andrews Group in Anchorage. (Term: 2001 - 2007)

Douglas Baily is an attorney member from Juneau. He served as Attorney General for Governor Cowper, is in private practice in Juneau and has practiced law in Alaska for nearly 40 years. (Term: 2004 - 2010)

James Cannon is an attorney member from Fairbanks. Mr. Cannon is in private practice in Fairbanks. He previously served as a public defender in Fairbanks from 1980-2005. He has practiced law since 1975. (Term 2006-2012)

Bill Gordon is a non-attorney member from Fairbanks. He is a lifelong Alaskan who served as Executive Assistant to Governor Hammond, served as chair of the Alcohol Beverage Control Board, and is a semi-retired consultant and part owner of public water and wastewater companies in interior Alaska. (Term: 2003 - 2009)

Susan Orlansky is an attorney member from Anchorage. She is a partner in the firm of Feldman, Orlansky, and Sanders and has practiced law in Alaska for 25 years. (Term: 2002 - 2008)

Christena Williams is a non-attorney member from Ketchikan. She is a third generation Alaskan and newspaper co-publisher. She and her family own and operate Pioneer Printing Co., Inc. and the Ketchikan Daily News. (Term 2005 - 2011)

See www.ajc.state.ak.us for detailed judicial evaluation information.

District Court Judge (Sample pamphlet page submitted by Judge)

Brian K. Clark, Third Judicial District



DATE OF BIRTH: August 4, 1966

PLACE OF BIRTH: Midland, TX

MAILING ADDRESS: 825 W. Fourth Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN ALASKA: 33 years
Anchorage 1972-1994, 1997-present
Fairbanks 1994, September-
December 7, 1994
Barrow December 7, 1994-1997

EDUCATION:
Dimond High School, Anchorage, AK, 1980-1984,
Diploma; University of Colorado Boulder, 1984-1988, B.A.
Linguistics; Willamette University, College of Law, Salem,
OR, 1988-1991, J.D.

POLITICAL AND GOVERNMENT POSITIONS:
Law Clerk, Oregon Department of Justice, 1989-1991;
Law Clerk, Alaska Court of Appeals, Judge David
Mannheimer, 1991-1992; Assistant District Attorney,
Anchorage, Palmer, Fairbanks, Barrow, 1994-2000;
Assistant Attorney General, Office of Special
Prosecutions and Appeals, 2000-2001; Chief Assistant
Attorney General, Office of Special Prosecutions and
Appeals, 2001-2002.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS:
Lawyer, Lane Powell Spears Lubersky, 1992-1994.

SERVICE ORGANIZATION(S) MEMBERSHIP:
Alaska Bar Association

SPECIAL INTERESTS:
Hiking, Tennis, Reading.

STATEMENT:

I have lived in Alaska since 1972. After attending college and law school, I returned because of my strong desire to stay in Alaska and serve the community where I was raised. As an Assistant District Attorney and Assistant Attorney general in Anchorage, Barrow, Fairbanks, and Palmer, I became familiar with the issues that face all Alaskans when they become involved with our justice system. This experience has enabled me to deal efficiently with the high volume of cases in the Anchorage district court. In criminal cases, I strive to make sentencing decisions that meet both the needs of the community and the victim, as well as addressing a defendant's rehabilitation. In civil cases, I listen carefully to the parties and take the time to reach decisions that are well reasoned and just.

Equally important is the effect my experience has had upon reinforcing my commitment to treat everyone who becomes involved in our justice system fairly and with respect. To that end, I have greatly enjoyed both serving and being a member of this community for the past 33 years, and I hope to continue serving as a judge in Anchorage.

Provided and paid for by the candidate. The text of this statement is presented as submitted by the candidate in accordance with AS 15.58.030 and 6 AAC 25.700.

(Sample voter pamphlet individual judge page submitted by the Council)

Alaska Judicial Council Recommendation

Judge Brian K. Clark, District Court, Anchorage

Judicial Council Recommendation

The Alaska Judicial Council, a non-partisan citizens commission established by the Alaska constitution, evaluates judges on a number of criteria, including their legal ability, demeanor, their diligence, their ability to manage their caseloads, and their fairness and integrity. The Judicial Council finds Judge Clark to be **Qualified** and recommends unanimously that the public vote "Yes" to retain him as a district court judge.

Judicial Council Evaluation

The Judicial Council surveyed 3,036 attorneys, 1,492 peace and probation officers, social workers/guardians ad litem, and child advocates, jurors, and court employees about the judges on the ballot. Respondents were asked to rate judicial performance and to submit comments. The Council also reviewed the ratings and observations of the Alaska Judicial Observers, independent community-based volunteers. The Council reviewed court system records concerning peremptory challenges, recusals, and appellate affirmance and reversal rates; any civil or criminal litigation involving the judge; APOC and court system conflict-of-interest statements; any disciplinary files; and whether a judge's pay was withheld for an untimely decision. The Council investigated judicial conduct in specific cases. The Council interviewed some judges, attorneys, court staff, and others. The Council held a statewide public hearing to obtain comments about judges.

	Attorney Survey	Peace Officer Survey	Juror Survey	Court Employee Survey	Social Workers Guardians ad Litem CASA's
Legal Ability	4.2	---	---	---	---
Impartiality	4.4	4.5	5.0	4.5	---
Integrity	4.5	4.6	---	4.5	---
Temperament	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.6	---
Diligence	4.4	4.5	---	4.5	---
Overall	4.3	4.5	5.0	4.6	---

Ratings are based on a one to five scale. Five is the best rating and three is "acceptable."

Rating Scale

5.0 = Excellent
4.0 = Good
3.0 = Acceptable
2.0 = Deficient
1.0 = Poor

Summary of Survey Information

Attorneys in Alaska rated Judge Clark on the six categories summarized in the table above, using 5 as the highest rating possible. The attorney rating for Judge Clark on overall performance was 4.3. Peace and probation officers rated Judge Clark on five categories, using the 5-point scale above. They gave Judge Clark a rating of 4.5.

Four other groups also evaluated Judge Clark's performance, using the same 5-point scale with 5 as the highest rating. Jurors rated him 5.0, and court employees gave him 4.6. There were no responses from social workers, guardians ad litem and CASA volunteers. The Alaska Judicial Observers rated him 3.6.

Recommendation: Vote "YES" to retain Judge Brian K. Clark

Contact the Judicial Council at 1029 W. 3rd, Suite 201, Anchorage, AK 99501 (telephone: (907) 279-2526)
for more detailed information, or review the information on our Internet site at:

www.ajc.state.ak.us

November 2006

Attachment C
(2006 retention vote analysis memo)



alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969 (907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
http://www.ajc.state.ak.us E-Mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Eleanor Andrews
Bill Gordon
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Douglas Bailly
James H. Cannon
Susan Orlansky

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Dana Fabe
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council Members
FROM: Staff
DATE: December 8, 2006
RE: 2006 Retention Vote Analysis

A. Number of Judges

Thirty-one judges stood for retention in November 2006: three in the First District (two superior court and one district court), two in the Second District (two superior court), twenty-one in the Third District (eleven superior court; ten district court), and five in the Fourth District (three superior court, two district court).

B. Percentage of voters in different races

Percentages of votes cast in different races	Total	Percent of Total Voters
Congressional Race	234,645	98.5% of 238,307 total ballots
Governor	237,322	99.6% of 238,307 total ballots
Alaska Senate Races		The range of those voting in each district who cast a ballot in a Senate race went from 60% to 40%
First Judicial District	29,151	Range from 89% (Weeks) to 82% (Zervos)
Second Judicial District	8,314	Range from 94% (Erich) to 93% (Esch)
Third Judicial District	158,590	Range from 80% to 77%
Fourth Judicial District	40,864	Range from 87% to 86%

The purpose of this table is to show that most voters who cast a vote in the statewide congressional race also voted in one or more judicial elections.¹ Depending on the judicial district, 77% to 94% of the voters participated in judicial elections. This was a noticeably higher percentage of voters participating in judicial elections than in 2000 (when the percentages ranged from 77% to 81%). Voters in the smaller districts (First, Second and Fourth) were more likely to vote in a judicial election than were those in the Third District. Some voters in the Third District may have been discouraged from voting by the high number of judges on the ballot in that district (twenty-one judges). Many more voters typically cast a ballot in judicial elections than in races for the Alaska Senate, where the percentages never went above 60%.

C. Trial Court Judges in Specific Judicial Districts

1. First District

Superior Court judges Larry Weeks (Juneau, 76%) and Larry Zervos (Sitka, 73%) both received relatively high “yes” vote percentages. Neither was opposed in any way.

District Court judge Kevin Miller (Ketchikan, 78%) also received a “yes” vote percentage that was relatively high in the context of statewide percentages. This has been typical of Southeast judges for many years.

2. Second District

Two judges stood in the Second District. Judge Erlich (Kotzebue) received 69% “yes” votes, and Judge Esch received 66% “yes” votes. Neither was opposed.

3. Third Judicial District

Eleven Third District superior court judges stood for retention in 2006. Their “yes” vote percentages ranged from Judge Brown in Kenai (58%) and Judge Tan in Anchorage (59%) to Judge Eric Smith in Palmer (62%) and Judge Bolger in Kodiak (63%). Judge Brown received some negative radio and newspaper publicity. The Council vote to retain Judge Brown was not unanimous which also may have affected the percentage of “yes” votes for Judge Brown. Judge Tan had received negative publicity in 2000 during his previous retention election, but did not receive additional negative publicity that the Council was aware of in 2006.

Ten district court judges stood, six in Anchorage (Clark, Lohff, Motyka, Murphy and Rhoades and Jack Smith). Three (Judges Estelle, Heath, and Wolfe) stood in Palmer, and Judge Landry stood in Kenai. With the exception of Judge Landry, the “yes” vote percentages ranged from 64% (Judge Clark in Anchorage) to 60% (Judge Rhoades in Anchorage). A bail decision attributed to Judge Rhoades received some unfavorable publicity shortly before the election. That may have affected the percentage of “yes” votes for Judge Rhoades.

¹ The congressional race serves as a benchmark because it is statewide and occurs every two years, thus is the best available comparison to judicial races to show voter interest.

Judge Landry was opposed by the Judicial Council with a unanimous “no” vote recommendation. *The Anchorage Daily News* and the *Anchorage Times* wrote editorials a few days before the election backing the Council’s recommendation. The Council paid for newspaper ads throughout the Third Judicial District for two weeks before the election that included its recommendations of “yes” votes on the other twenty judges and a “no” vote for Judge Landry. Judge Landry was not retained, receiving only 47% “yes” votes.

Judge Landry was the first judge to be not retained since 1982, when the Council recommended “no” votes on two Anchorage District Court judges. The Council also recommended a “no” vote on an Anchorage Superior Court judge in 1988. That judge was retained, but by a smaller margin than the other judges in the Third Judicial District. In 1988, the Council did not publicize the concerns that caused it to recommend against the judge. In 2006, the Council decided to publicize its particular concerns to allow the public to make an informed decision.

4. Fourth District

Three superior court judges (Devaney, Olsen and Wood) and two district court judges (Burbank and Kauvar) stood for retention. None of them experienced any opposition, and all were retained with “yes” vote percentages ranging from 67% (Judge Devaney in Bethel) to 72% (Judge Wood in Fairbanks). “Yes” vote percentages for the Fourth District judges historically tend to be somewhat higher than for judges in the Third Judicial District.

1976 - 2006 Retention Vote History																
	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Supreme Court																
Current Supreme Court Justices																
Bryner													61.4%			
Carpeneti														66.7%		
Eastaugh												64.9%				
Fabe													57.1%			
Matthews			53.5%					65.1%					60.8%			
Past Supreme Court Justices																
Boochever	67.8%															
Burke		68.6%					72.9%									
Connor				61.5%												
Compton					69.7%					64.3%						
Moore						69.1%										
Rabinowitz		67.8%					59.0%									
Court of Appeals																
Current Court of Appeals Judges																
Coats					68.1%				60.7%				63.9%			
Mannheimer										64.9%				65.5%		
Stewart													65.5%			
Past Court of Appeals Judges																
Bryner					68.5%				62.4%							
Singleton					68.9%											
First Judicial District																
Current Superior Court Judges - First Judicial District																
Collins														76.2%		
Stephens															75.1%	
Thompson											73.9%			72.2%		
Weeks										70.2%			71.0%			77.5%
Zervos										68.6%			67.2%			73.1%
Past Superior Court Judges - First Judicial District																
Carpeneti					77.0%			76.0%			75.1%					
Compton			76.1%													
Craske			70.4%			72.5%										
Jahnke							72.3%			70.7%						
Pegues					75.4%											
Schulz		74.8%			74.1%			72.0%								
Stewart, T.	72.8%															

1976 - 2006 Retention Vote History																
	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
District Court																
Current District Court Judges - First Judicial District																
Miller														75.0%		78.0%
Past District Court Judges - First Judicial District																
Asper						72.5%										
Collins												80.0%				
Craske	78.2%															
Froehlich								73.0%		70.5%		72.8%		70.1%		
Gucker					67.9%		71.1%		69.0%							
Keene		73.9%		76.4%												
Taylor, R.		75.1%														
Williams	71.5%		59.1%													
Second Judicial District																
Current Superior Court Judges - Second Judicial District																
Erlich										74.2%			65.5%			68.7%
Esch													60.5%			66.1%
Jeffery						76.3%			73.0%			70.5%			69.4%	
Past Superior Court Judges - Second Judicial District																
Jones					75.6%											
Tunley					71.4%			72.0%								

1976 - 2006 Retention Vote History																
	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Third Judicial District																
Current Superior Court Judges - Third Judicial District																
Bolger																63.3%
Brown													66.0%			57.9%
Christen															68.8%	
Cutler						68.9%			63.0%			66.5%			66.1%	
Gleason															68.8%	
Huguelet																60.4%
Joannides															67.9%	
Michalski							69.9%			64.9%			56.9%			61.4%
Morse																60.8%
Rindner															67.6%	
Smith, Eric													65.6%			62.4%
Suddock																60.6%
Tan													54.4%			58.8%
Torrisi													64.8%			61.0%
Volland																61.1%
Wolverton													67.4%			61.2%
Past Superior Court Judges - Third Judicial District																
Andrews										65.7%			69.3%			
Bosshard							68.6%									
Buckalew	62.2%			59.9%												
Card											64.3%			68.5%		
Carlson		67.4%			63.6%											
Cranston					65.1%			61.0%								
Fabe									63.0%							
Gonzalez							65.2%			62.0%			65.7%			
Hanson			54.7%													
Hensley													67.1%			
Hopwood										63.3%			65.4%			
Hunt							72.3%			66.0%						
Johnstone				52.0%			58.1%			62.6%						
Kalamarides	64.2%															
Katz (Woodward)							70.5%			62.1%						
Link										64.3%			66.1%			
Madsen		64.1%			62.1%											
Moody		64.6%														
Reese									62.0%			64.6%				
Ripley		67.8%			64.2%			63.0%								
Rowland			61.0%			69.6%			62.0%							
Sanders													66.6%			
Serdahely					68.1%											
Shortell					67.4%			63.0%			65.2%					
Singleton			missing													
Souter				56.4%			68.7%			62.0%						

1976 - 2006 Retention Vote History																
	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Current District Court Judges - Third Judicial District																
Clark																63.8%
Estelle																61.3%
Heath																62.4%
Joannides											67.3%					
Landry																47.4%
Lohff										65.5%		67.6%		68.2%		61.1%
Motyka										65.2%		66.7%		68.2%		61.7%
Murphy, S.										66.5%		67.7%		69.1%		62.0%
Nolan															70.6%	
Rhoades										63.7%		65.9%		66.2%		60.3%
Wolfe																62.9%
Past District Court Judges - Third Judicial District																
Adams														70.5%		
Anderson			63.7%		72.4%		74.3%									
Andrews				66.1%		71.2%		67.0%								
Ashman							70.6%		63.0%		65.7%		68.4%			
Beckwith						69.8%		66.0%								
Bolger													67.4%			
Bosshard		67.1%		57.9%												
Brewer		55.6%		45.5%												
Bryner	66.2%															
Cutler		69.5%		63.0%												
Finn					72.4%		72.8%		65.0%		67.1%		68.4%			
Fuld					68.3%		68.5%		61.0%		63.3%					
Hornaday		66.6%		59.8%		67.2%										
Lombardi													68.7%			
Mason	63.7%		57.8%		58.1%		68.2%		61.0%							
Neville										65.8%		67.4%		66.2%		
Peterson	68.3%															
Smith, Jack																62.6%
Stemp						67.8%										
Stewart, D						70.5%										
Tucker		64.9%		54.5%												
Vochoska		51.6%		42.3%												
Wanamaker											65.4%		66.5%			
White						70.5%										
Wolverton								66.0%		66.8%						

1976 - 2006 Retention Vote History																
	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
Fourth Judicial District																
Current Superior Court Judges - Fourth Judicial District																
Devaney																66.9%
Olsen																69.2%
Steinkruger									64.0%			66.0%			70.1%	
Wood																71.5%
Past Superior Court Judges - Fourth Judicial District																
Beistline											71.8%					
Blair		73.4%			65.4%											
Cooke			68.4%													
Curda										66.9%			56.3%			
Greene							67.6%			65.6%			51.9%			
Hodges			65.7%			69.2%			67.0%							
Pengilly															67.7%	
Savell								70.0%			72.0%				68.7%	
Taylor, W.			72.8%													
Van Hoomisen			72.3%			72.2%										
Current District Court Judges - Fourth Judicial District																
Burbank																71.4%
Funk													63.9%		71.1%	
Kauvar				68.7%		72.0%		70.0%		69.8%		68.9%		67.7%		70.3%
Past District Court Judges - Fourth Judicial District																
Clayton	75.9%		missing													
Cline			55.5%													
Connelly		74.3%		71.8%		74.2%										
Crutchfield				67.9%		71.3%		69.0%								
Miller, M.A.		62.2%														
Pengilly									68.0%		71.3%					
Wood											73.1%		67.5%			
Zimmerman						74.8%										

Appendix G

**Retention Election History
for Judges Currently Serving on the Bench**

Deliberately left blank

Appendix G

Retention Election History for Judges Currently Serving on the Bench

Note: Years shown in italics and parentheses indicate when a judge stood for retention in a prior position.

Supreme Court Justices			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every ten years thereafter.</i>			
Justice	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Alexander O. Bryner	01/24/97	<i>(76, 84, 92)</i> 00	2010
Walter L. Carpeneti	11/04/98	<i>(84, 90, 96)</i> 02	2012
Robert Eastaugh	01/29/94	98	2008
Dana A. Fabe	01/26/96	<i>(92)</i> 00	2010
Warren W. Matthews	05/26/77	80, 90, 00	2010

Court of Appeals			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every eight years thereafter.</i>			
Judge	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Robert G. Coats	07/30/80	84, 92, 00	2008
David Mannheimer	10/11/90	94, 02	2010
David Stewart	06/25/97	<i>(86)</i> 00	2008

Retention Election History
 (continued)

First Judicial District			
Judge	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Superior Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every six years thereafter.</i>			
Patricia A. Collins - Juneau	03/27/99	(98) 02	2008
Trevor Stephens - Ketchikan	07/31/00	04	2010
Michael A. Thompson - Ketchikan	01/21/93	96, 02	2008
Larry Weeks - Juneau	09/03/90	94, 00, 06	2012
Larry C. Zervos - Sitka	09/14/90	(90) 94, 00, 06	2012
District Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than two years after appointment; every four years thereafter.</i>			
Kevin G. Miller - Ketchikan	08/30/99	02, 06	2010
Keith B. Levy - Juneau	01/24/05	None	2008

Second Judicial District			
Judge	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Superior Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every six years thereafter.</i>			
Richard H. Erlich - Kotzebue	03/08/91	94, 00, 06	2012
Ben Esch - Nome	02/16/96	00, 06	2012
Michael I. Jeffery - Barrow	10/28/82	86, 92, 98, 04	2010
District Court Judges			
<i>No District Court Judge positions in the Second Judicial District.</i>			

Retention Election History (continued)

Third Judicial District			
Judge	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Superior Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every six years thereafter.</i>			
Eric A. Aarseth - Anchorage	11/30/05	None	2010
Joel H. Bolger - Kodiak	09/02/03	(00) 06	2012
Harold M. Brown - Kenai	04/08/96	00, 06	2012
Morgan Christen - Anchorage	10/25/01	04	2010
Beverly W. Cutler - Palmer	10/28/82	(78, 82) 86, 92, 98, 04	2010
Sharon L. Gleason - Anchorage	02/19/01	04	2010
Charles Huguelet - Kenai	09/02/03	06	2012
Stephanie E. Joannides - Anchorage	04/10/00	(96) 04	2010
Kari Kristiansen - Palmer	11/17/06	None	2010
Patrick J. McKay - Anchorage	11/30/05	None	2010
Peter A. Michalski - Anchorage	01/31/85	88, 94, 00, 06	2012
William F. Morse - Anchorage	02/27/02	06	2012
Mark Rindner - Anchorage	10/20/00	04	2010
Eric Smith - Palmer	04/18/96	00, 06	2012
Jack Smith - Anchorage	11/17/06	(06)	2010
Michael Spaan - Anchorage	11/17/06	None	2010
Craig F. Stowers - Anchorage	09/21/04	None	2008
John Suddock - Anchorage	11/14/02	06	2012
Sen K. Tan - Anchorage	12/04/96	00, 06	2012
Fred Torrisi - Dillingham	11/27/96	00, 06	2012
Philip R. Volland - Anchorage	11/14/02	06	2012
Vanessa H. White - Palmer	11/17/06	None	2010
Michael L. Wolverton - Anchorage	12/04/96	(90, 94) 00, 06	2012
District Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than two years after appointment; every four years thereafter.</i>			
Brian K. Clark - Anchorage	06/11/03	06	2010
William L. Estelle - Palmer	06/11/03	06	2010
Pat Hanley - Anchorage	01/14/05	None	2008
Gregory Louis Heath - Palmer	10/11/03	06	2010
John R. Lohff - Anchorage	03/08/91	94, 98, 02, 06	2010
Gregory Motyka - Anchorage	07/26/91	94, 98, 02, 06	2010
Margaret L. Murphy - Homer	04/20/05	None	2008
Sigurd E. Murphy - Anchorage	07/08/92	94, 98, 02, 06	2010
Nancy Nolan - Anchorage	02/19/01	04	2008
Stephanie Rhoades - Anchorage	07/30/92	94, 98, 02, 06	2010
Daniel Schally - Valdez	01/17/05	None	2008
Alex M. Swiderski - Anchorage	04/11/05	None	2008
John W. Wolfe - Palmer	11/01/04	06	2010

Retention Election History
 (continued)

Fourth Judicial District			
Judge	Appointed	Prior Retention Elections	Next Retention Election
Superior Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than three years after appointment; every six years thereafter.</i>			
Douglas L. Blankenship - Fairbanks	03/10/06	None	2010
Leonard R. Devaney, III - Bethel	02/27/02	06	2012
Robert B. Downes - Fairbanks	04/20/05	None	2008
Randy M. Olsen - Fairbanks	04/28/03	06	2012
Niesje J. Steinkruger - Fairbanks	08/26/88	92, 98, 04	2010
Mark I. Wood - Fairbanks	08/30/02	(96, 00) 06	2012
District Court Judges			
<i>Retention Dates: First general election held more than two years after appointment; every 4 years thereafter.</i>			
Winston S. Burbank - Fairbanks	04/28/03	06	2010
Dennis P. Cummings - Bethel	11/30/05	None	2008
Raymond Funk - Fairbanks	04/16/98	00, 04	2008
Jane F. Kauvar - Fairbanks	02/18/81	82, 86, 90, 94, 98, 02,06	2010

2008 Retention Election Candidates			
Judge	Court Level	Date Appointed	Prior Retention Elections
Supreme Court Justices			
Robert Eastaugh	N/A	01/29/94	98
Court of Appeals			
Robert G. Coats	N/A	07/30/80	84, 92, 00
David Stewart	N/A	06/25/97	(86) 00
First Judicial District			
Patricia A. Collins - <i>Juneau</i>	Superior	03/27/99	(98) 02
Michael A. Thompson - <i>Ketchikan</i>	Superior	01/21/93	96, 02
Keith B. Levy - <i>Juneau</i>	District	01/24/05	<i>None</i>
Third Judicial District			
Craig F. Stowers - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	09/21/04	<i>None</i>
Pat Hanley - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	01/14/05	<i>None</i>
Margaret L. Murphy - <i>Homer</i>	District	04/20/05	<i>None</i>
Nancy Nolan - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	02/19/01	04
Daniel Schally - <i>Valdez</i>	District	01/17/05	<i>None</i>
Alex M. Swiderski - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	04/11/05	<i>None</i>
Fourth Judicial District			
Robert B. Downes - <i>Fairbanks</i>	Superior	04/20/05	<i>None</i>
Dennis P. Cummings - <i>Bethel</i>	District	11/30/05	<i>None</i>
Raymond Funk - <i>Fairbanks</i>	District	04/16/98	00, 04
<i>Total = 15 standing for retention</i>			

Note: Years shown in italics and parentheses indicate when a judge stood for retention in a prior position.

2010 Retention Election Candidates			
Judge	Court Level	Date Appointed	Prior Retention Elections
Supreme Court Justices			
Alexander O. Bryner	N/A	01/24/97	<i>(76, 84, 92)</i> 00
Dana A. Fabe	N/A	01/26/96	<i>(92)</i> 00
Warren W. Matthews	N/A	05/26/77	80, 90, 00
Court of Appeals			
David Mannheimer	N/A	10/11/90	94, 02
First Judicial District			
Trevor Stephens - <i>Ketchikan</i>	Superior	07/31/00	04
Kevin G. Miller - <i>Ketchikan</i>	District	08/30/99	02, 06
Second Judicial District			
Michael I. Jeffery - <i>Barrow</i>	Superior	10/28/1982	86, 92, 98, 04
Third Judicial District			
Eric A. Aarseth - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/30/05	<i>None</i>
Morgan Christen - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	10/25/01	04
Beverly W. Cutler - <i>Palmer</i>	Superior	10/28/82	<i>(78, 82)</i> 86, 92, 98, 04
Sharon L. Gleason - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	02/19/01	04
Stephanie E. Joannides - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	04/10/00	<i>(96)</i> 04
Kari Kristiansen - <i>Palmer</i>	Superior	11/17/06	<i>None</i>
Patrick J. McKay - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/30/05	<i>None</i>
Mark Rindner - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	10/20/00	04
Jack Smith - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/17/06	<i>(06)</i>
Michael Spaan - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/17/06	<i>None</i>
Vanessa H. White - <i>Palmer</i>	Superior	11/17/06	<i>None</i>
Brian K. Clark - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	01/23/03	06
William L. Estelle - <i>Palmer</i>	District	06/11/03	06
Gregory Louis Heath - <i>Palmer</i>	District	11/25/03	06
John R. Lohff - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	03/08/91	94, 98, 02, 06
Gregory Motyka - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	07/26/91	94, 98, 02, 06
Sigurd E. Murphy - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	07/08/92	94, 98, 02, 06
Stephanie Rhoades - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	07/30/92	94, 98, 02, 06
John W. Wolfe - <i>Palmer</i>	District	11/01/04	06
<i>Anchorage District - Currently open</i>			
<i>Kenai District - Currently open</i>			
Fourth Judicial District			
Douglas L. Blankenship	Superior	03/10/06	<i>None</i>
Niesje J. Steinkruger - <i>Fairbanks</i>	Superior	08/26/88	92, 98, 04
<i>Bethel Superior - Currently open</i>			
<i>Fairbanks Superior - Currently open</i>			
Winston S. Burbank - <i>Fairbanks</i>	District	04/28/03	06
Jane F. Kauvar - <i>Fairbanks</i>	District	02/18/81	82, 86, 90, 94, 98, 02, 06
<i>Total = 34 standing for retention</i>			

Note: Years shown in italics and parentheses indicate when a judge stood for retention in a prior position.

2012 Retention Election Candidates			
Judge	Court Level	Date Appointed	Prior Retention Elections
Supreme Court Justices			
Walter L. Carpeneti	N/A	11/04/98	(84, 90, 96) 02
First Judicial District			
Larry Weeks - <i>Juneau</i>	Superior	09/03/90	94, 00, 06
Larry C. Zervos - <i>Sitka</i>	Superior	09/14/90	(90) 94, 00, 06
Keith B. Levy - <i>Juneau</i>	District	01/24/05	08
Second Judicial District			
Richard H. Erlich - <i>Kotzebue</i>	Superior	03/08/91	94, 00, 06
Ben Esch - <i>Nome</i>	Superior	02/16/96	00, 06
Third Judicial District			
Joel H. Bolger - <i>Kodiak</i>	Superior	09/02/03	(00) 06
Harold M. Brown - <i>Kenai</i>	Superior	04/08/96	00, 06
Charles Huguélet - <i>Kenai</i>	Superior	09/02/03	06
Peter A. Michalski - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	01/31/85	88, 94, 00, 06
William F. Morse - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	02/27/02	06
Eric Smith - <i>Palmer</i>	Superior	04/18/96	00, 06
John Suddock - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/14/02	06
Sen K. Tan - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	12/04/96	00, 06
Fred Torrisi - <i>Dillingham</i>	Superior	11/27/96	00, 06
Philip R. Volland - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	11/14/02	06
Michael L. Wolverton - <i>Anchorage</i>	Superior	12/04/96	(90, 94) 00, 06
Pat Hanley - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	01/14/05	08
Margaret L. Murphy - <i>Homer</i>	District	04/20/05	08
Nancy Nolan - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	02/19/01	04, 08
Daniel Schally - <i>Valdez</i>	District	01/17/05	08
Alex M. Swiderski - <i>Anchorage</i>	District	04/11/05	08
Fourth Judicial District			
Leonard R. Devaney, III - <i>Bethel</i>	Superior	02/27/02	06
Randy M. Olsen - <i>Fairbanks</i>	Superior	04/28/03	06
Mark I. Wood - <i>Fairbanks</i>	Superior	08/30/02	(96, 00) 06
Dennis P. Cummings - <i>Bethel</i>	District	11/30/05	08
Raymond Funk - <i>Fairbanks</i>	District	04/16/98	00, 04, 08
Total = 27 standing for retention			

Note: Years shown in italics and parentheses indicate when a judge stood for retention in a prior position.

Deliberately left blank

Appendix H

Summary of Programs and Recommendations of the Council since Statehood:1959-2006

Deliberately left blank

Appendix H

Summary of Programs and Recommendations of the Council Since Statehood: 1959-2006

Article 4, Section 9 of Alaska's Constitution states:

The judicial council shall conduct studies for the improvement of the administration of justice, and make reports and recommendations to the supreme court and to the legislature at intervals of not more than two years.

The topics studied by the Judicial Council at the request of the legislature and supreme court cover as wide a range as the constitutional language mandating these studies. The following list summarizes some of the more important contributions in the years since statehood.

A. Recommendations Relating to the Judiciary and the Courts

1. Evaluation of judges standing for retention elections and recommendations to the public (1975).
2. Establishment of the Commission on Judicial Qualifications (1968). (Name changed in 1982 to Commission on Judicial Conduct.)
3. Legislation relating to judicial salaries and retirement plans.
4. Increased jurisdictions of district court judges.
5. Court facilities and court management programs.
6. Jury size and length of service.
7. Authority of magistrates.
8. Supervision of the procedure of revising rules of court (1959-1961).
9. Waiver of juvenile jurisdiction in minor traffic cases (Ch. 76, SLA 1961).
10. Establishment of Family Court (Ch. 100, SLA 1967).
11. Appellate review of sentences (CH. 117, SLA 1969).
12. Coroner-Public Administrator office (Ch. 216, SLA 1970).
13. Constitutional amendment rotating the office of Chief Justice (approved by electorate in 1970).
14. Recommendation for presentence reports in all felony convictions (enacted by court rule in 1974).
15. Revised criteria for judges serving *pro tem* (court, Administrative Rule 23).
16. Guidelines for evaluation of *pro tem* judges (court, Administrative Rule 23).

17. Use of television for arraignments and other court proceedings on a permanent basis (experimental rule made permanent by supreme court in August, 1986).
18. Adoption of a court rule to provide guidelines for judicial review and dissemination of grand jury reports (Criminal Rule 6.1 adopted by supreme court, 1989).
19. Revised media plan and judicial canons to permit use of cameras in court proceedings (Administrative Rule 50, 1990).
20. Extension of district court judge's "probationary" period for retention elections to two years rather than one year (approved by legislature, 1990).
21. Court should work with voluntary local dispute resolution organizations, including tribal courts and councils, to provide better justice services in rural areas (1993).
22. Retain Civil Rule 82 (attorney fee shifting) with some modifications (1995).
23. Court emphasis on the child's best interest in child in need of aid cases. Court should reduce delay, provide training, and take other steps to more actively participate in child in need of aid cases (1996).
24. Revise court rules and establish pilot projects to increase voluntary use of alternative dispute resolution (1997).
25. Establish an implementation committee to review and carry out, as appropriate, recommendations of the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Fairness and Access (1997). (Implementation Committee established, 1998.)
26. Revise court procedures for selecting juries to improve process (Advisory Committee to the Supreme Court on Fairness and Access) (1997).
27. Consider ways to improve judicial writing skills (1999).
28. Compile objective data on judicial performance and use in evaluation (1999).
29. Improve existing video links and expand use of video links to other court proceedings (1999).
30. Define purposes of civil case data collection more precisely (2000).
31. Eliminate legislative requirement for reporting civil case data in every case; require reporting only when Judicial Council is asked to study civil case processing (2001).
32. Amend court rules related to civil case data collection to be internally consistent and consistent with the statutes; clarify submission of data on appellate cases (2001).
33. Use civil case data to assist court assessment of time standards (2001).
34. Encourage use of alternative dispute resolution in civil cases (2001).
35. Expand use of therapeutic justice principles statewide (2003).
36. Expand eligibility standards to include more defendants in the felony drug court (2003).
37. Court should encourage criminal justice agencies in working together to eliminate unwanted disparities in justice system (2004).

B. Recommendations Relating to Other Aspects of the Administration of Justice

1. Compilation of the records of the constitutional convention.
2. Adoption of Rule 40(e) of the uniform rules of the legislature (requiring 2/3 vote of the legislature to change rules of court).
3. Establishment of Public Defender Agency (Ch. 109, SLA 1969).
4. Parole Board autonomy (granted in 1972).
5. Modernization of the state recording system (1966).
6. Various recommendations regarding probation and parole services, including administration of probation by courts.
7. Recommendations regarding juvenile services.
8. Extensive analysis of Bush Justice needs and recommendations.
9. Monthly statistical reporting system on sentences (established by courts and corrections in 1962).
10. Reclassification of minor traffic offenses as noncriminal.
11. Presumptive sentencing for repeat felony offenders and others (adopted by legislature, 1978).
12. Revision of presentence reports to meet requirements of new criminal code and reduce disparities in sentencing (1981).
13. Establishment of diversion program for some defendants (undertaken by Department of Law, 1980-81).
14. Annual monitoring of felony and misdemeanor sentencing patterns (authorized by legislature, 1980).
15. Development of mail-in bail schedule for minor Fish and Game offenses (authorized by legislature, 1984; adopted by supreme court 1985).
16. Establishment of Code Revision Commission to revise laws and regulations governing fish and game offenses.
17. Focus of justice system resources on efforts to encourage completion of alcohol treatment programs and monitoring of compliance with treatment requirements (similar recommendation adopted by Governor's Task Force on Drunk Driving, 1984).
18. Development of sentencing guidelines for drug offenses (used in 1981 and 1982 until drug law revisions took effect January 1, 1983).
19. Establishment of alternative jail facilities for persons convicted of Driving While Intoxicated and other alcohol-related offenses (recommended by Department of Corrections and considered by legislature).
20. Establishment of a Sentencing Commission to review existing sentencing laws and practices in context of state's needs and resources (Commission established June 1990 through June 1993).

21. Creation of a pilot program to mediate disputes in child visitation cases (program established October 1990); establish permanent mediation program for mediation of custody and visitation issues.
22. Maintenance of high screening standards by Attorney General's office for criminal cases (1991).
23. Coordination of Attorney General's charge bargaining policies with actual charge bargaining practices (1991).
24. Examination of appellate court sentencing benchmarks and guidelines, to determine whether some case law should be statutory (1991).
25. Summarize appellate court benchmarks and sentencing criteria to make them accessible to judges, attorneys and public (1991).
26. Cooperate with the legitimate voluntary dispute resolution work done by tribal courts (the Council takes no position on the resolution of sovereignty issues) and other rural dispute resolution organizations (1993).
27. Coordinate activities and share data among all criminal justice information systems (1993).
28. Review of computerized document imaging systems (1993).
29. Preparation of appellate case management and document imaging software for the Alaska Appellate Courts (1993-94).
30. Various recommendations for the legislature and agencies regarding child in need of aid cases (1996).
31. Recommendations for improving fairness and access throughout the justice system (Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Fairness and Access, 1997).
32. Consider new models for monitoring offenders (1999).
33. Make more resources and information available to victims of domestic violence (1999).
34. Continue research on domestic violence (1999).
35. Create an organization to implement recommendations of the Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (2000).
36. Various recommendations for criminal justice, including alcohol policy, decriminalizing mentally ill, analysis of criminal justice process, and better monitoring of pretrial defendants and post-conviction conditions imposed on misdemeanants (CJAC, 2000).
37. Further recommendations for criminal justice, following up after implementing CJAC recommendations (CJC, 2003).
38. Take steps to reduce unwarranted disparities throughout the criminal justice system; review charging and charge reduction practices; collect better data about ethnicity and socioeconomic characteristics of defendants (2004).

Appendix I

Council Publications Since Statehood

Deliberately left blank

Appendix I

Council Publications Since Statehood

Biennial Reports

1. **The First Annual Report.** (Jan., 1961). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during 1960.
2. **Second Annual Report.** (Jan., 1962). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during 1962.
3. **Alaska Judicial Council Third Report 1962-1963.** (Jan., 1964). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1962-1963.
4. **Alaska Judicial Council Fourth Report 1964-1966.** (Jan., 1967). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1964-1966.
5. **Alaska Judicial Council Fifth Report 1967-1968.** (Jan., 1969). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1967-1968.
6. **Alaska Judicial Council Sixth Report 1969-1970.** (Feb., 1971). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1969-1970.
7. **Alaska Judicial Council Seventh Report 1971-1972.** (Feb., 1973). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1971-1972.
8. **Eighth Report to the Supreme Court and Legislature 1973-1975.** (Feb., 1976). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1973-1975.
9. **Ninth Report to Supreme Court and Legislature 1976-1978.** (March, 1978). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1976-1978.
10. **Tenth Report of the Alaska Judicial Council to the Supreme Court and Legislature 1979-1980.** (Feb., 1981). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1979-1980.
11. **Eleventh Report of the Alaska Judicial Council to the Supreme Court and Legislature 1981-1982.** (March, 1983). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1981-1982.
12. **Twelfth Report: 1983-1984 to the Legislature and Supreme Court.** (March, 1985). Review of the Council's activities and recommendations during the period 1983-1984;
13. **Thirteenth Report: 1985-1986 to the Legislature and Supreme Court.** (May, 1987). Review of the Council's activities in 1985 and 1986.
14. **Fourteenth Report: 1987-1988 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (June, 1989). Review of the Council's activities in 1987 and 1988.
15. **Fifteenth Report: 1989-1990 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (April, 1991). Review of the Council's activities in 1989 and 1990.
16. **Sixteenth Report: 1991-1992 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 1993). Review of the Council's activities in 1991 and 1992.

17. **Seventeenth Report: 1993-1994 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 1995). Review of the Council's activities in 1993 and 1994.
18. **Eighteenth Report: 1995-1996 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 1997). Review of the Council's activities in 1995 and 1996.
19. **Nineteenth Report: 1997-1998 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 1999). Review of the Council's activities in 1997 and 1998.
20. **Twentieth Report: 1999-2000 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 2001). Review of the Council's activities in 1999 and 2000.
21. **Twenty-First Report: 2001-2002 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (January, 2003). Review of the Council's activities in 2001 and 2002.
22. **Twenty-Second Report: 2003-2004 to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (March, 2005). Review of the Council's activities in 2003 and 2004.
23. **Twenty-Third Report to the Legislature and Supreme Court** (February, 2007). Review of the Council's activities in 2005 and 2006.

Policy Reports

(all reports available at www.ajc.state.ak.us/admin.htm)

1. **The Alaska Public Defender Agency in Perspective.** (Jan., 1974). An analysis of the law, finances, and administration from 1969 to 1974. The report resulted in amendments to Title 18, improving Public Defender services.
2. **Report on Policy Considerations for Court Fee Structures.** (Feb., 1974). Resulted in changes to court system policies regarding fees collected for adoptions, recording services, and child support.
3. **Evaluation of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction.** (1974, unpublished). Resulted in establishment of superior court judgeships in Kodiak and Sitka.
4. **Judicial Districting.** (Jan., 1975). Resulted in creation of Barrow and Bethel service areas by court order.
5. **The Grand Jury in Alaska.** (Feb., 1975). Resulted in preliminary hearing pilot project in Anchorage and experimental rule change by supreme court.
6. **Sentencing in Alaska.** (March, 1975). Statistical analysis of felony sentences imposed in 1973.
7. **Bail in Anchorage.** (March, 1975). Statistical analysis of bail practices for Anchorage felony cases in 1973.
8. **1973 Sentences of Five Years or Longer.** (April, 1975). Analysis of factors contributing to lengthy sentences, and the impact of appellate review of sentencing.
9. **Report on Repeat Bail Recidivists in 1973.** (April, 1975). Case-by-case analysis of defendants who violated bail conditions by committing more than one new crime while on bail for a felony offense.
10. **Alaska Felony Sentencing Patterns: A Multivariate Statistical Analysis -- 1974-1976.** (April, 1977). Study requested by the legislature and used to structure presumptive sentencing provisions of the new criminal code. Also resulted in the creation of the Sentencing Guidelines Committee.
11. **Interim Report on the Elimination of Plea Bargaining.** (May, 1977). Summarized effects of the Attorney General's 1975 ban on plea bargaining as reported by attorneys, judges, and defendants.

12. **The Anchorage Citizen Dispute Center: A Needs Assessment and Feasibility Report.** (1977). Analysis of dispositions of minor disputes reported to Anchorage Police Department. Recommended establishment of alternative dispute resolution procedures for certain types of situations. Resulted in establishment of a pilot dispute resolution process in Anchorage (1981) through the Department of Law.
13. **A Look Inside: A Pilot Project in Citizen Involvement with the Judicial System.** (Oct., 1978). Contributed to citizen participation in all aspects of the justice system, and to revised procedures for the evaluation of judges.
14. **Interim Report of the Alaska Judicial Council on Findings of Apparent Racial Disparity in Sentencing.** (Oct., 1978). Summary of data accumulated on felony case dispositions and sentencing patterns from Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau (1974-1976) giving evidence of racial and other disparities in sentencing for certain types of offenses. Resulted in legislation creating the Advisory Committee on Minority Judicial Sentencing Practices, and funding of Judicial Council follow-up studies of felonies and misdemeanors. See text of Tenth Report for other effects.
15. **The Effect of the Official Prohibition of Plea Bargaining on the Disposition of Felony Cases in Alaska Criminal Courts.** (Dec., 1978). [Reprinted by the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. as ALASKA BANS PLEA BARGAINING, 1979]. Evaluates the effectiveness and consequences of the Attorney General's 1975 ban on plea bargaining, including the results of over 400 interviews with attorneys, judges, and criminal justice personnel, and two-year felony statistical study.
16. **Alaska Misdemeanor Sentences: 1974-76 Plea Bargaining.** (Aug., 1979). Analysis of misdemeanor sentences to determine effect of plea bargaining ban on sentences imposed after trial or plea.
17. **"Northrim Survey": An Analysis of the Results of a Survey for the Alaska Judicial Council.** (Aug., 1979). Prepared for the Judicial Council by Northrim Associates. Analyzes the findings of a survey of registered voters asked to comment on the 1978 retention election results.
18. **Alaska Misdemeanor Sentences: 1974-76 Racial Disparity.** (Nov., 1979). Analysis of existence of racial disparity in misdemeanor sentences; shows significant disparity for several categories of offense.
19. **Sentencing Under Revised Criminal Code.** (Jan., 1980). Probation Officer training manual for the revised criminal code.
20. **Alaska Felony Sentences: 1976-1979.** (Nov., 1980). Follow-up study requested by the legislature on felony disparities; shows disappearance of most racial disparities. Additional analysis and findings on sentences in rural areas, effects of attorney type, and possible continuing trends from the plea bargaining ban.
21. **Recommendations of the Alaska Judicial Council to the Supreme Court Proposing Changes to the Civil Rules to Reduce Excessive Costs and Delays of Civil Litigation.** (1981). Details proposed changes to the civil litigation system to reduce deterrents to pursuing or defending claims with a value of under \$25,000 through the implementation of an "economical litigation program."
22. **A Preliminary Statistical Description of Fish & Game Sentences.** (1981). Reviews data from Fish and Wildlife Protection data tapes; finds sufficient disparities to warrant full-scale statistical analysis.
23. **Alaska Prison Population Impact Analysis.** (1982). Funded by Division of Corrections. Estimates growth in sentenced felon prison populations based on potential and actual legislative changes.
24. **Alaska Felony Sentences: 1980.** (December 1982). Study requested by the legislature as a continued monitoring of sentence disparities and analysis of the effects of the revised criminal code. Shows disappearance of disparities (racial and attorney type), shortened sentence lengths.

25. **Statistical Analysis of Major Fish & Game Offense Sentencing Outcomes.** (Dec., 1983). Funded by the legislature in 1982 to study sentences imposed on 1980 and 1981 fish and game violators. Found widespread disparities and fluctuations in charging and sentencing patterns. Recommended complete revision of applicable statutes and codes.
26. **Alaska Misdemeanor Sentences: 1981.** (Dec., 1983). Funded by the legislature to analyze misdemeanor sentences imposed during 1981. Recommended alcohol treatment programs for convicted defendants and increased legislative sanctions for DWI to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related crime.
27. **DWI Sentences: 1981.** (March, 1984). Additional analysis of DWI (drunk driving) sentences included in the 1981 Misdemeanor Study data base. Types of sentences imposed for DWI convictions and characteristics of offenders are described.
28. **Interim Evaluation Report Fairbanks Closed Circuit TV Arraignment Program.** (August 1985). Interim evaluation of the experimental closed circuit TV arraignment project in Fairbanks. Presents recommendations for improvement of project.
29. **Fairbanks Televised Arraignments Final Report.** (March 21, 1986). Final evaluation of the use of television for arraignments, plea changes and other proceedings. Based on the report, a permanent court rule allowing televised hearings was adopted by the Alaska Superior Court.
30. **The Investigative Grand Jury in Alaska.** (February, 1987). Describes the history of the investigative grand jury and grand jury reports in Alaska. Recommends a new court rule to provide due process protections for persons named in reports, judicial review of reports, and guidelines for publication and dissemination of reports.
31. **Alaska Felony Sentences: 1984.** (March, 1987). Describes felony sentencing patterns for 1984 cases. Analyzes the impacts of presumptive sentencing and other criminal justice system changes between 1980 and 1986.
32. **News Cameras in the Alaska Courts: Assessing the Impact.** (January, 1988). Evaluation of the Supreme Court's experimental programs, including statistical analysis of increased news coverage. Based on the report, a revised media plan and judicial canons have been promulgated by the Supreme Court.
33. **Alaska Bar Membership Survey** (July, 1989). An economic and demographic survey of the membership of the Alaska Bar Association.
34. **Alaska Sentencing Commission 1990 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature** (December 1990). The Judicial Council supervised the Sentencing Commission staff during the Commission's work (1990-1993). The first report emphasized Alaska sentencing law and practices, and the Commission's planned work.
35. **Alaska's Plea Bargaining Ban Re-evaluated** (January 1991). An analysis of data and interviews showing the career of Alaska's ban on plea bargaining and its interactions with presumptive sentencing and other changes in the justice system between 1975 and 1990.
36. **Appellate Sentence Review in Alaska** (January, 1991). A historical analysis of appellate sentence review in Alaska, and analysis of current benchmarks and guidelines for sentencing established by the appellate courts. Also published as an Alaska Law Review article (December 1990).
37. **Alaskan Rural Justice: A Selected Annotated Bibliography** (May 1991). A selected bibliography of materials related to rural justice in Alaska, including anthropology, law, sociology, and related fields.
38. **Alaska Sentencing Commission 1991 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature** (December 1991). The second Sentencing Commission report focused on issues that the Commission had considered, especially intermediate sanctions.

39. **Alaska Child Visitation Mediation Pilot Project** (February 1992). Describes the pilot program established by the legislature to offer mediation for parents with visitation disputes. Recommends expansion of the project and continuation in another agency.
40. **Resolving Disputes Locally: Alternatives for Rural Alaska** (August 1992). Evaluates three rural organizations that resolve disputes—Minto and Sitka tribal courts, and the PACT conciliation organization in Barrow. Recommends increased cooperation among state courts and local dispute resolution organizations.
41. **Alaska Sentencing Commission 1992 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature** (December 1992). The Sentencing Commission's final report set out recommendations on use of alternative punishments, Natives, parole, classification and public policies for fiscal decisions about sentencing issues.
42. **Resolving Disputes Locally: A Statewide Report and Directory** (April 1993). Reports over one hundred local organizations that resolve disputes in rural Alaska. Describes interactions among these groups and state and local governments. Recommends ways to improve access to justice in rural areas of the state.
43. **Managing Documents with Imaging Technology: Implementing imaging at the Alaska Judicial Council** (August 1993).
44. **Managing Documents with Imaging Technology: A Review of the Computer Software and Hardware Evaluated by the Alaska Judicial Council** (August 1993). Evaluates imaging systems for small organizations. Describes available software, hardware; develops criteria for choosing a system.
45. **Plan for the Integration of Alaska's Criminal Justice Computer Systems and the Creation of a Comprehensive Criminal History Repository** (May 1994). Makes recommendations to Alaska's criminal justice agencies and the legislature for upgrading and coordinating criminal justice computer information systems.
46. **A Consumer Guide to Selecting a Mediator** (July 1995). Summarizes mediator qualifications and describes process for selecting a mediator.
47. **A Guide to Alaska's Criminal Justice System** (July 1995). Describes the criminal justice system in Alaska as a guide for those involved in it as well as for media, students, and the general public. (Revised 1998)
48. **Alaska's English Rule: Attorney's Fee Shifting in Civil Cases** (October 1995). Gives historical background, legal analysis, case file analysis and attorney and judge perspectives on Alaska's Civil Rule 82.
49. **A Handbook for Victims of Crime in Alaska** (January 1996). Describes the criminal justice process in Alaska to aid victims in understanding its structure, and their role and rights. (Revised 2001)
50. **Improving the Court Process for Alaska's Children in Need of Aid** (October 1996). First assessment of the court's role in child in need of aid cases. Makes numerous recommendations for courts and other agencies to improve the process.
51. **"Analysis of Case File Data: Alaska Tort Jury Verdicts, 1985-1995"** (November 1996). A brief memo reporting tort jury verdicts, damages, costs and fees awarded, prepared for the Governor's Task Force on Civil Justice.
52. **Use of DNA Profiles in Criminal Proceedings in Alaska** (November 1996). Information about the technical, legal and scientific use of DNA profiles in criminal proceedings.

53. **Report of the Alaska Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Fairness and Access** (October 1997). The Judicial Council provided staff support for this committee, including preparation of the committee's report. The report documents ethnic and cultural minorities' needs in the courts and recommends specific means of improving rural access to courts, jury selection, public perception of the courts, court employment policies, and use of interpreters.
54. **Report to the Alaska Legislature: Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Alaska Court System** (December 1997). The 1997 "Tort Reform" legislation required the Council to work with the Alaska Court System to design an alternative dispute resolution project that could be implemented in the summer of 1998.
55. **A Guide to Alaska's Criminal Justice System** (July 1995, Rev. May 1998). A comprehensive overview of Alaska's adult and juvenile criminal justice system, including statutory provisions, flow charts, glossaries, sentencing information and a list of resources.
56. **Guia del Sistema Juridico de Alaska** (Mayo de 1998). Spanish version of "A Guide to Alaska's Criminal Justice System."
57. **A Handbook for Victims of Crime in Alaska** (January 1996, Rev. May 1998, Rev. Sept. 2001). Brief manual about the criminal justice process and the victim's role, rights, and resources (revision of the 1998 Handbook).
58. **Un Manual para las Victimas de Delitos en Alaska** (Septiembre de 2001). Spanish version of "A Handbook for Victims of Crime in Alaska."
59. **Internet Access to Appellate Case Data** (March 1999). The Alaska Appellate Courts, with technical assistance provided by the Alaska Judicial Council, made its computerized appellate case management system available to attorneys and the public over the Internet.
60. **A Directory of Dispute Resolution in Alaska Outside Federal and State Courts** (March 1999). An overview of Alaska dispute resolution entities other than state and federal courts.
61. **Fostering Judicial Excellence: A Profile of Alaska's Judicial Applicants and Judges** (May 1999). Results of the Judicial Council's study of the characteristics of attorneys who apply for and are appointed to the state court bench in Alaska.
62. **Como Escoger Un Mediador Una Guia para la Clientela** (May 1999). Spanish version of "A Consumer Guide to Selecting a Mediator." Describes how to find and select a mediator to help resolve a dispute. The guide incorporates current research and policy information on mediator qualifications into a five-step process for lawyers, judges, litigants, and other consumers of mediation services.
63. **Fairbanks Video Arraignment Assessment** (May 1999). Alaska Judicial Council's assessment of the Fairbanks video arraignment system.
64. **Evaluation of Bethel Video Link** (July 1999). Evaluation of the video link between the courthouse and the Yukon Kuskokwim Correctional Center.
65. **Evaluation of a Pilot Probation Program for Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Offenders** (July 1999). Evaluation of a fifteen-month pilot project in Palmer, Alaska funded by the federal Violence Against Women Act.
66. **Mediation, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and the Alaska Court System** (December 1999). A Guide for attorneys, judges, and persons who are considering using alternative dispute resolution (ADR) help them resolve a dispute. This Guide explains the benefits and differences among mediation, arbitration, and other ADR processes. It offers resources to contact for more information, and it provides information on the Alaska Court System's free ADR programs.

67. **A Guide to Alaska Child in Need of Aid Cases** (November 1999). A Guide describing how abused, neglected, and runaway children are protected by the State of Alaska. It also offers resources to contact for more information.
68. **An Analysis of Civil Case Data Collected from September 1997 - May 1999** (February 2000). In 1997 the legislature passed tort reform legislation which required that the Alaska Judicial Council report on closed civil cases, using data from forms filled in by attorneys and parties in the cases. This report summarizes the findings from the data and makes recommendations for future data collection.
69. **Final Report of the Alaska Criminal Justice Assessment Commission** (May 2000). Governor Tony Knowles, Chief Justice Warren Matthews, Senate President Mike Miller, and House Speaker Gail Phillips established the Criminal Justice Assessment Commission to review, develop, and implement strategies within the criminal justice system so that all offenders are held appropriately accountable for their conduct. The Judicial Council provided staff support for the Commission. Recommendations for the state on dealing with alcohol abuse and mental health issues in the criminal justice system.
70. **Alaska Judicial Applicant Guidelines** (October 2000). A joint publication by the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct, the Alaska Judicial Council, and the Alaska Bar Association.
71. **Alaska Civil Cases June 1999 - December 2000** (May 2001). In 1997, responding to public interest in tort reform and the work of the Governor's Advisory Task Force on Civil Justice, the legislature passed tort reform legislation. One part of the legislation responded to the Task Force's recommendation that the Alaska Judicial Council report on closed civil cases, using data from forms completed by attorneys and parties in the cases. This report summarizes the findings from the data reported to the Council from June 1, 1999 through December 1, 2000, and from data collected from court case files in various locations. Included with this report are recommendations for future data collection and changes to the legislation.
72. **Interim Status Report of the Alaska Criminal Justice Council** (January 2002). This report describes the progress made in carrying out the May 2000 Criminal Justice Assessment Commission recommendations. The report organizes the CJAC recommendations by the degree of progress made, from completed recommendations to those on which no action has been taken.
73. **Court Coordinated Resources Project Evaluation** (January 2003). Evaluation of the CCRP, better known as the Mental Health Court, a therapeutic court for misdemeanants with mental health problems.
74. **Recommendations of the Alaska Criminal Justice Council** (January 2003). Successor organization to the Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (CJAC), created to carry out the CJAC recommendations. Final report summarizes work accomplished and recommendations for future work. Table appended showing the distribution of justice system resources throughout the state.
75. **Alaska Felony Process: 1999** (February 2004). The Alaska Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Fairness and Access recommended that the Judicial Council compile data on Alaska felony cases. The Council reviewed predisposition incarceration, charge reductions, case dismissals, sentencing, post-disposition incarceration and total time incarcerated. It found evidence that the system was generally even-handed, but found some disparities by ethnicity, type of attorney, gender and rural location. The report includes descriptive data about the court process for cases filed as felonies in 1999, and a detailed description of the multivariate analysis, findings and recommendations.
76. **Evaluation of the Outcomes in Three Therapeutic Courts (April 2005)**. Evaluation of the outcomes (changes in days of incarceration, numbers of remands, numbers of convictions) for the Anchorage Felony Drug Court, the Anchorage Felony DUI Court, and the Bethel Therapeutic Court. The data showed improvements on all measures for the graduates of all three programs, and conversely, significantly more days of incarceration for the comparison defendants during the two years after their target offense. Participants in the program also appeared to improve in education, employment and family stability while in the program.

77. **Court Innovations in Domestic Violence Cases: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary** (August 2005): Evaluation of two innovative domestic violence projects funded for the Anchorage civil court by the federal government in 2002. The report includes data about the domestic violence civil process in Anchorage, and an analysis of changes in long term orders issued, child support and custody issues dealt with in domestic violence cases, and reduction in repeated domestic violence after the innovative projects began operations.
78. **Therapeutic Justice Statewide Database** (September 2006): Design for a statewide, web-based database for the court system, to be used by all therapeutic and problem-solving courts. The report includes a description of current data collection efforts, a discussion of possible barriers to data collection, a consideration of legal and confidentiality issues, proposed data elements, flowcharts, a discussion of incentives and sanctions, and brief descriptions of national guidelines for the therapeutic court databases.
79. **The Domestic Violence Index Evaluation** (September 2006): Evaluation of an index that pulls together domestic violence–related cases for Alaska Court System staff using the CourtView case management program. The Council surveyed and interviewed users of the pilot index, and found that the index could help court staff respond more quickly with needed information about parties in domestic violence cases. The index needed revisions, which were being made at the time of the evaluation.