



**UAA** Center for Behavioral  
Health Research & Services  
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

# Alaska Judicial Council

## Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

### Technical Report

Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Assistant Professor  
Maia Wen, Undergraduate Research Assistant  
Elizabeth Williams, Undergraduate Research Assistant  
Staci Corey, M.S., Project Manager

*April 29, 2016*  
Revised June 30, 2016

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs](http://uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Justices/Judges .....	2
Introduction.....	4
Methodology.....	4
Instrumentation .....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety/Management .....	5
Results .....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 2: Respondents' Level of Experience with Justices/Judges .....	7
Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings.....	9
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 4: Joel H. Bolger: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	11
Table 5: Joel H. Bolger: Detailed Responses .....	11
Table 6: Peter J. Maassen: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	12
Table 7: Peter J. Maassen: Detailed Responses .....	12
Table 8: Marjorie K. Allard: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	13
Table 9: Marjorie K. Allard: Detailed Responses .....	13
Table 10: David V. George: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	14
Table 11: David V. George: Detailed Responses .....	14
Table 12: Philip M. Pallenberg: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	15
Table 13: Philip M. Pallenberg: Detailed Responses .....	15
Table 14: Trevor Stephens: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 15: Trevor Stephens: Detailed Responses .....	16
Table 16: Thomas G. Nave: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	17
Table 17: Thomas G. Nave: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 18: Eric A. Aarseth: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	18
Table 19: Eric A. Aarseth: Detailed Responses .....	18
Table 20: Catherine M. Easter: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	19
Table 21: Catherine M. Easter: Detailed Responses .....	19
Table 22: Kari Kristiansen: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	20
Table 23: Kari Kristiansen: Detailed Responses .....	20
Table 24: Erin B. Marston: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	21
Table 25: Erin B. Marston: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 26: Anna M. Moran: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	22
Table 27: Anna M. Moran: Detailed Responses .....	22
Table 28: Mark Rindner: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	23
Table 29: Mark Rindner: Detailed Responses .....	23
Table 30: Kevin Saxby: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	24
Table 31: Kevin Saxby: Detailed Responses .....	24
Table 32: Jack W. Smith: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	25
Table 33: Jack W. Smith: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 34: Vanessa H. White: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	26
Table 35: Vanessa H. White: Detailed Responses .....	26
Table 36: Leslie N. Dickson: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	27
Table 37: Leslie N. Dickson: Detailed Responses .....	27
Table 38: J. Patrick Hanley: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	28
Table 39: J. Patrick Hanley: Detailed Responses .....	28

Table 40:	Jennifer Stuart Henderson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	29
Table 41:	Jennifer Stuart Henderson: Detailed Responses.....	29
Table 42:	Margaret L. Murphy: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	30
Table 43:	Margaret L. Murphy: Detailed Responses .....	30
Table 44:	Daniel Schally: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	31
Table 45:	Daniel Schally: Detailed Responses .....	31
Table 46:	Alex M. Swiderski: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	32
Table 47:	Alex M. Swiderski: Detailed Responses.....	32
Table 48:	David R. Wallace: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	33
Table 49:	David R. Wallace: Detailed Responses .....	33
Table 50:	Pamela Scott Washington: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	34
Table 51:	Pamela Scott Washington: Detailed Responses .....	34
Table 52:	David Zwink: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	35
Table 53:	David Zwink: Detailed Responses .....	35
Table 54:	Douglas L. Blankenship: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	36
Table 55:	Douglas L. Blankenship: Detailed Responses .....	36
Table 56:	Bethany Spalding Harbison: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	37
Table 57:	Bethany Spalding Harbison: Detailed Responses .....	37
Table 58:	Jane F. Kauvar: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	38
Table 59:	Jane F. Kauvar: Detailed Responses.....	38
Table 60:	Michael A. MacDonald: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	39
Table 61:	Michael A. MacDonald: Detailed Responses .....	39
Table 62:	Dwayne McConnell: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	40
Table 63:	Dwayne McConnell: Detailed Responses.....	40
Table 64:	Matthew Christian: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	41
Table 65:	Matthew Christian: Detailed Responses .....	41
Table 66:	Patrick S. Hammers: Description of Respondents' Experience .....	42
Table 67:	Patrick S. Hammers: Detailed Responses .....	42
Table 68:	Nathaniel Peters: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	43
Table 69:	Nathaniel Peters: Detailed Responses .....	43

## *Executive Summary*

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska justices and judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska court employees to obtain their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2016 retention survey included 2 supreme court justices, 1 appeals court judge, and 30 trial court judges eligible for retention.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked court employees to evaluate the justices and judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall Rating*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each justice/judge by respondents with direct professional experience on all five characteristics. Within each district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges.

**Table 1**  
**Mean Ratings of Justices/Judges**

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
<b><u>Supreme Court Justices</u></b>						
Joel H. Bolger	42	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Peter J. Maassen	26	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
<b><u>Court of Appeals</u></b>						
Marjorie K. Allard	19	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
David V. George	23	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.3
Philip M. Pallenberg	33	4.3	4.6	4.4	3.8	4.2
Trevor Stephens	38	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<i>District Court</i>						
Thomas G. Nave	26	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Eric A. Aarseth	49	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Catherine M. Easter	42	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
Kari Kristiansen	32	3.9	4.2	3.7	4.2	4.0
Erin B. Marston	32	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Anna M. Moran	30	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9
Mark Rindner	33	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Kevin Saxby	25	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.6
Jack W. Smith	23	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7
Vanessa H. White	25	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.0

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the justices/judges.

**Table 1 (continued)**  
**Mean Ratings of Justices/Judges**

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>District Court</i>						
Leslie N. Dickson	36	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4
J. Patrick Hanley	44	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Jennifer S. Henderson	33	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Margaret L. Murphy	18	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.0
Daniel Schally	18	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.3
Alex M. Swiderski	33	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5
David R. Wallace	41	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6
Pamela S. Washington	45	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
David Zwink	27	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Douglas Blankenship	45	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.1	4.0
Bethany S. Harbison	40	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Jane F. Kauvar	45	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.3
Michael A. MacDonald	44	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Dwayne McConnell	16	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
<i>District Court</i>						
Matthew Christian	39	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6
Patrick S. Hammers	39	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Nathaniel Peters	13	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the justices/judges.

# Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

## ***Introduction***

Alaska statutes require that the Alaska Judicial Council evaluate justices and judges standing for retention in an election year. The Council makes a recommendation to the State's voters to either retain or not retain each justice and judge. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Judicial Council distributed surveys to Alaska court employees and asked them to rate justices/judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, and Overall Rating.*

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Center for Behavioral Health Research and Services (CBHRS), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. CBHRS was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection for the survey as well as data analysis. CBHRS prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

This 2016 retention survey included 2 supreme court justices, 1 appeals court judge, and 30 trial court judges eligible for retention.

## ***Methodology***

Alaska court employees, including law clerks, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of 641 total employees invited to participate, 378 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 60.0%. Of the 378 returned surveys, 44 did not rate any of the justices/judges; 334 (88.4%) respondents evaluated one or more justices/judges.

## ***Instrumentation***

The survey contained the names of the justices/judges eligible for retention, five evaluation items for each justice/judge, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each justice/judge.

Respondents evaluated justices/judges in five areas of performance. Detailed instructions for each domain were provided:

*Impartiality/Fairness:* Please evaluate the justice's/judge's sense of basic fairness and justice and whether the justice/judge treats all parties equally.

*Integrity:* Please evaluate whether the justice's/judge's conduct is free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety and whether the justice/judge makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.

*Judicial Temperament:* Please evaluate the justice's/judge's courtesy and freedom from arrogance and whether the justice/judge manifests human understanding and compassion.

*Diligence:* Please evaluate whether the justice/judge is prepared for court proceedings, works diligently, and is reasonably prompt in making decisions.

*Overall Evaluation:* Please provide your overall assessment of the justice's/judge's performance.

Respondents assigned ratings for each domain using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided:

(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court	Meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court	Consistently exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court

## ***Confidentiality and Data Safety/Management***

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at CBHRS and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial retention survey are of a sensitive nature, CBHRS has rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. All data are maintained on a secure server.

Each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis.



## ***Results***

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

In the tables, justice/judges appear in order based on court/district. Within each district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges.

### ***Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Justice/Judge***

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

Table 2 shows the type of experience of respondents for each justice/judge.

### ***Ratings of Justices/Judges***

Table 3 presents results on the *Overall Rating* item by comparing all respondents to those with direct professional experience; the table presents the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*) as well as the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*).

For each individual justice/judge, Tables 4-69 provide a summary of respondents' experience with each justice/judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience.

**Table 2**  
**Respondents' Level of Experience with the Justices/Judges**

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated justice/judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b><u>Supreme Court</u></b>					
J. H. Bolger	53	14.0	79.2	5.7	15.1
P. J. Maassen	33	8.7	78.8	9.1	12.1
<b><u>Court of Appeals</u></b>					
M. K. Allard	26	6.9	73.1	3.8	23.1
<b><u>First District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
D. V. George	33	8.7	69.7	18.2	12.1
P. M. Pallenberg	40	10.6	82.5	10.0	7.5
T. Stephens	47	12.4	80.9	14.9	4.3
<i>District Court</i>					
T. G. Nave	31	8.2	83.9	9.7	6.5
<b><u>Third District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
E. A. Aarseth	68	18.0	72.1	19.1	8.8
C. M. Easter	52	13.8	80.8	11.5	7.7
K. Kristiansen	42	11.1	76.2	14.3	9.5
E. B. Marston	38	10.1	84.2	13.2	2.6
A. M. Moran	35	9.3	85.7	8.6	5.7
M. Rindner	43	11.4	76.7	18.6	4.7
K. Saxby	32	8.5	78.1	18.8	3.1
J. W. Smith	32	8.5	71.9	15.6	12.5
V. H. White	38	10.1	65.8	23.7	10.5

**Table 2 (continued)**  
**Respondents' Level of Experience with the Justices/Judges**

		Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...				
		<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated justice/judge	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b><u>Third District</u></b>						
<i>District Court</i>						
	L. N. Dickson	45	11.9	80.0	8.9	11.1
	J. P. Hanley	55	14.6	80.0	12.7	7.3
	J. S. Henderson	41	10.8	80.5	14.6	4.9
	M. L. Murphy	21	5.6	85.7	9.5	4.8
	D. Schally	21	5.6	85.7	9.5	4.8
	A. M. Swiderski	45	11.9	73.3	17.8	8.9
	D. R. Wallace	51	13.5	80.4	13.7	5.9
	P. S. Washington	54	14.3	83.3	13.0	3.7
	D. Zwink	37	9.8	73.0	18.9	8.1
<b><u>Fourth District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
	D. Blankenship	51	13.5	88.2	9.8	2.0
	B. S. Harbison	47	12.4	85.1	10.6	4.3
	J. F. Kauvar	55	14.6	81.8	10.9	7.3
	M. A. MacDonald	53	14.0	83.0	13.2	3.8
	D. McConnell	19	5.0	84.2	10.5	5.3
<i>District Court</i>						
	M. Christian	46	12.2	84.8	8.7	6.5
	P. S. Hammers	45	11.9	86.7	8.9	4.4
	N. Peters	14	3.7	92.9	-	7.1

**Table 3**  
**Summary of Overall Ratings**

	<b>All Respondents</b>				<b>Respondents with Direct Professional Experience</b>			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b><u>Supreme Court</u></b>								
J. H. Bolger	49	4.8	5.0	0.5	40	4.8	5.0	0.5
P. J. Maassen	30	4.9	5.0	0.3	26	4.8	5.0	0.4
<b><u>Court of Appeals</u></b>								
M. K. Allard	26	4.7	5.0	0.6	19	4.7	5.0	0.6
<b><u>First District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
D. V. George	33	4.1	4.0	0.8	23	4.3	5.0	0.8
P. M. Pallenberg	36	4.3	4.0	0.8	29	4.2	4.0	0.9
T. Stephens	45	4.8	5.0	0.5	37	4.8	5.0	0.4
<i>District Court</i>								
T. G. Nave	31	4.5	5.0	0.6	26	4.6	5.0	0.6
<b><u>Third District</u></b>								
<i>District Court</i>								
E. A. Aarseth	56	4.5	5.0	0.8	44	4.6	5.0	0.8
C. M. Easter	50	4.5	5.0	0.6	40	4.5	5.0	0.6
K. Kristiansen	42	4.0	4.0	0.9	32	4.0	4.0	0.9
E. B. Marston	38	4.7	5.0	0.5	32	4.7	5.0	0.5
A. M. Moran	34	3.8	4.0	1.0	29	3.9	4.0	1.0
M. Rindner	43	4.5	5.0	0.6	33	4.5	5.0	0.6
K. Saxby	31	4.6	5.0	0.7	23	4.6	5.0	0.7
J. W. Smith	32	4.6	5.0	0.6	23	4.7	5.0	0.6
V. H. White	37	4.2	4.0	0.9	24	4.0	4.0	1.1

**Table 3 (continued)**  
**Summary of Overall Ratings**

	<b>All Respondents</b>				<b>Respondents with Direct Professional Experience</b>			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b><u>Third District</u></b>								
<i>District Court</i>								
L. N. Dickson	43	4.3	5.0	0.8	35	4.4	5.0	0.8
J. P. Hanley	54	4.8	5.0	0.4	44	4.8	5.0	0.4
J. S. Henderson	40	4.7	5.0	0.6	32	4.7	5.0	0.7
M. L. Murphy	21	4.0	4.0	0.8	18	4.0	4.0	0.9
D. Schally	21	4.2	4.0	0.6	18	4.3	4.0	0.6
A. M. Swiderski	44	4.4	5.0	0.7	33	4.5	5.0	0.6
D. R. Wallace	50	4.6	5.0	0.7	40	4.6	5.0	0.7
P. S. Washington	53	4.4	5.0	0.7	45	4.5	5.0	0.6
D. Zwink	37	4.5	5.0	0.7	27	4.5	5.0	0.7
<b><u>Fourth District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
D. Blankenship	49	4.0	4.0	0.9	43	4.0	4.0	0.9
B. S. Harbison	46	4.7	5.0	0.5	39	4.8	5.0	0.5
J. F. Kauvar	54	4.4	5.0	0.8	44	4.3	4.5	0.8
M. A. MacDonald	51	4.5	5.0	0.9	43	4.5	5.0	0.9
D. McConnell	19	4.3	5.0	1.0	16	4.3	5.0	1.1
<i>District Court</i>								
M. Christian	44	4.6	5.0	0.6	37	4.6	5.0	0.6
P. S. Hammers	44	4.5	5.0	0.7	38	4.5	5.0	0.7
N. Peters	14	4.6	5.0	0.5	13	4.6	5.0	0.5

**Table 4**  
**Joel H. Bolger**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Justice</b>		
Direct professional experience	42	79.2
Professional reputation	3	5.7
Other personal contacts	8	15.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	38	90.5
Substantial amount of experience	13	31.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	35.7
Limited amount of experience	13	31.0

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

**Table 5**  
**Joel H. Bolger**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	53	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	38	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.7	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	13	5.0	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	8	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8

**Table 6**  
**Peter J. Maassen**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Justice</b>		
Direct professional experience	26	78.8
Professional reputation	3	9.1
Other personal contacts	4	12.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	96.2
Substantial amount of experience	12	46.2
Moderate amount of experience	9	34.6
Limited amount of experience	5	19.2

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

**Table 7**  
**Peter J. Maassen**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 8**  
**Marjorie K. Allard**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Justice</b>		
Direct professional experience	19	73.1
Professional reputation	1	3.8
Other personal contacts	6	23.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	57.9
Moderate amount of experience	5	26.3
Limited amount of experience	3	15.8

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

**Table 9**  
**Marjorie K. Allard**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	26	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.8	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	6	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.5



**Table 10**  
**David V. George**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	23	69.7
Professional reputation	6	18.2
Other personal contacts	4	12.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	39.1
Moderate amount of experience	4	17.4
Limited amount of experience	10	43.5

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

**Table 11**  
**David V. George**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.1	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.8	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.5	3.8
Limited amount of experience	10	4.3	4.4	3.8	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	6	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.7
Other personal contacts	4	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.5

**Table 12**  
**Philip M. Pallenberg**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	33	82.5
Professional reputation	4	10.0
Other personal contacts	3	7.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	90.9
Substantial amount of experience	13	39.4
Moderate amount of experience	8	24.2
Limited amount of experience	11	33.3

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

**Table 13**  
**Philip M. Pallenberg**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	40	4.3	4.6	4.4	3.9	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.4	4.6	4.5	3.9	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.3	4.4	4.8	3.3	4.1
Limited amount of experience	11	3.7	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.7
Professional reputation	4	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.5
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7

**Table 14**  
**Trevor Stephens**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	38	80.9
Professional reputation	7	14.9
Other personal contacts	2	4.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	97.4
Substantial amount of experience	13	34.2
Moderate amount of experience	12	31.6
Limited amount of experience	13	34.2

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

**Table 15**  
**Trevor Stephens**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	47	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	37	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	13	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	13	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	7	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 16**  
**Thomas G. Nave**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	26	83.9
Professional reputation	3	9.7
Other personal contacts	2	6.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	46.2
Moderate amount of experience	8	30.8
Limited amount of experience	6	23.1

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

**Table 17**  
**Thomas G. Nave**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	31	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.6	4.6	5.0	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.5	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.6
Limited amount of experience	6	4.4	4.8	4.3	4.6	4.3
Professional reputation	3	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Table 18**  
**Eric A. Aarseth**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	49	72.1
Professional reputation	13	19.1
Other personal contacts	6	8.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	48	98.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	23	46.9
Limited amount of experience	19	38.8

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

**Table 19**  
**Eric A. Aarseth**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	68	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	48	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	23	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	19	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7
Professional reputation	13	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.9
Other personal contacts	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 20**  
**Catherine M. Easter**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	42	80.8
Professional reputation	6	11.5
Other personal contacts	4	7.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	39	92.9
Substantial amount of experience	8	19.0
Moderate amount of experience	19	45.2
Limited amount of experience	14	33.3

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

**Table 21**  
**Catherine M. Easter**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	52	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	39	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	14	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
Professional reputation	6	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5

**Table 22**  
**Kari Kristiansen**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	32	76.2
Professional reputation	6	14.3
Other personal contacts	4	9.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	34.4
Moderate amount of experience	8	25.0
Limited amount of experience	13	40.6

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

**Table 23**  
**Kari Kristiansen**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	42	3.9	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	32	3.9	4.2	3.7	4.2	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.2	4.5	3.8	4.4	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	8	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.7	3.4
Limited amount of experience	13	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	6	3.3	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.8

**Table 24**  
**Erin B. Marston**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	32	84.2
Professional reputation	5	13.2
Other personal contacts	1	2.6
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	31	96.9
Substantial amount of experience	8	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	46.9
Limited amount of experience	9	28.1

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

**Table 25**  
**Erin B. Marston**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	38	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	31	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0



**Table 26**  
**Anna M. Moran**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	30	85.7
Professional reputation	3	8.6
Other personal contacts	2	5.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	23.3
Moderate amount of experience	14	46.7
Limited amount of experience	8	26.7

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

**Table 27**  
**Anna M. Moran**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	35	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	27	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	14	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4
Limited amount of experience	8	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5

**Table 28**  
**Mark Rindner**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	33	76.7
Professional reputation	8	18.6
Other personal contacts	2	4.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	31	93.9
Substantial amount of experience	2	6.1
Moderate amount of experience	21	63.6
Limited amount of experience	10	30.3

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

**Table 29**  
**Mark Rindner**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	43	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	31	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	21	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	10	4.8	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.7
Professional reputation	8	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.4
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5

**Table 30**  
**Kevin Saxby**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	25	78.1
Professional reputation	6	18.8
Other personal contacts	1	3.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	96.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	28.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	36.0
Limited amount of experience	9	36.0

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

**Table 31**  
**Kevin Saxby**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	32	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.5	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Professional reputation	6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.3
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 32**  
**Jack W. Smith**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	23	71.9
Professional reputation	5	15.6
Other personal contacts	4	12.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	17.4
Moderate amount of experience	12	52.2
Limited amount of experience	7	30.4

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

**Table 33**  
**Jack W. Smith**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	32	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	4.0	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.8
Limited amount of experience	7	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	5	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0

**Table 34**  
**Vanessa H. White**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	25	65.8
Professional reputation	9	23.7
Other personal contacts	4	10.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	96.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	40.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	40.0
Limited amount of experience	5	20.0

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

**Table 35**  
**Vanessa H. White**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	38	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	10	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.6
Limited amount of experience	5	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	9	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.5

**Table 36**  
**Leslie N. Dickson**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	36	80.0
Professional reputation	4	8.9
Other personal contacts	5	11.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	97.2
Substantial amount of experience	7	19.4
Moderate amount of experience	12	33.3
Limited amount of experience	17	47.2

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

**Table 37**  
**Leslie N. Dickson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	45	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.1
Limited amount of experience	17	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
Professional reputation	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0
Other personal contacts	5	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3

**Table 38**  
**J. Patrick Hanley**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	44	80.0
Professional reputation	7	12.7
Other personal contacts	4	7.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	43	97.7
Substantial amount of experience	13	29.5
Moderate amount of experience	18	40.9
Limited amount of experience	13	29.5

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

**Table 39**  
**J. Patrick Hanley**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	55	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	43	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	18	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	7	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4
Other personal contacts	4	4.3	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3

**Table 40**  
**Jennifer Stuart Henderson**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	33	80.5
Professional reputation	6	14.6
Other personal contacts	2	4.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	97.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	27.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	27.3
Limited amount of experience	15	45.5

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

**Table 41**  
**Jennifer Stuart Henderson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	41	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	32	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	15	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4
Professional reputation	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5



**Table 42**  
**Margaret L. Murphy**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	18	85.7
Professional reputation	2	9.5
Other personal contacts	1	4.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	88.9
Substantial amount of experience	5	27.8
Moderate amount of experience	8	44.4
Limited amount of experience	5	27.8

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

**Table 43**  
**Margaret L. Murphy**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	16	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.0	3.6	3.8	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.6
Limited amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0

**Table 44**  
**Daniel Schally**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	18	85.7
Professional reputation	2	9.5
Other personal contacts	1	4.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	27.8
Moderate amount of experience	4	22.2
Limited amount of experience	9	50.0

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

**Table 45**  
**Daniel Schally**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.4	4.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	9	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.0

**Table 46**  
**Alex M. Swiderski**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	33	73.3
Professional reputation	8	17.8
Other personal contacts	4	8.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	90.9
Substantial amount of experience	8	24.2
Moderate amount of experience	12	36.4
Limited amount of experience	13	39.4

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

**Table 47**  
**Alex M. Swiderski**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	45	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.6
Limited amount of experience	13	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	8	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3

**Table 48**  
**David R. Wallace**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	41	80.4
Professional reputation	7	13.7
Other personal contacts	3	5.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	41	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	19.5
Moderate amount of experience	17	41.5
Limited amount of experience	16	39.0

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

**Table 49**  
**David R. Wallace**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	51	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	41	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	16	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.6
Other personal contacts	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7

**Table 50**  
**Pamela Scott Washington**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	45	83.3
Professional reputation	7	13.0
Other personal contacts	2	3.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	44	97.8
Substantial amount of experience	13	28.9
Moderate amount of experience	16	35.6
Limited amount of experience	16	35.6

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

**Table 51**  
**Pamela Scott Washington**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	54	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	44	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	16	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 52**  
**David Zwink**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	27	73.0
Professional reputation	7	18.9
Other personal contacts	3	8.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	96.3
Substantial amount of experience	16	59.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	33.3
Limited amount of experience	2	7.4

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

**Table 53**  
**David Zwink**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	37	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	16	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.4
Limited amount of experience	2	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	7	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1
Other personal contacts	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 54**  
**Douglas L. Blankenship**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	45	88.2
Professional reputation	5	9.8
Other personal contacts	1	2.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	44	97.8
Substantial amount of experience	8	17.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	31.1
Limited amount of experience	23	51.1

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

**Table 55**  
**Douglas L. Blankenship**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	51	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.1	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	44	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	14	3.9	3.9	3.4	4.0	3.8
Limited amount of experience	23	4.1	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.1
Professional reputation	5	4.0	4.2	3.2	4.2	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Table 56**  
**Bethany Spalding Harbison**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	40	85.1
Professional reputation	5	10.6
Other personal contacts	2	4.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	40	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	27.5
Moderate amount of experience	12	30.0
Limited amount of experience	17	42.5

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

**Table 57**  
**Bethany Spalding Harbison**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	47	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	40	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	17	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.2
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5



**Table 58**  
**Jane F. Kauvar**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	45	81.8
Professional reputation	6	10.9
Other personal contacts	4	7.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	43	95.6
Substantial amount of experience	11	24.4
Moderate amount of experience	9	20.0
Limited amount of experience	25	55.6

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

**Table 59**  
**Jane F. Kauvar**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	55	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	43	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	25	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.3
Professional reputation	6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5

**Table 60**  
**Michael A. MacDonald**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	44	83.0
Professional reputation	7	13.2
Other personal contacts	2	3.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	44	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	17	38.6
Limited amount of experience	16	36.4

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

**Table 61**  
**Michael A. MacDonald**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	53	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	44	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	16	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6
Professional reputation	7	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.3	4.1
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0

**Table 62**  
**Dwayne McConnell**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	16	84.2
Professional reputation	2	10.5
Other personal contacts	1	5.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	56.3
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	7	43.8

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

**Table 63**  
**Dwayne McConnell**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	19	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

**Table 64**  
**Matthew Christian**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	39	84.8
Professional reputation	4	8.7
Other personal contacts	3	6.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	89.7
Substantial amount of experience	12	30.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	35.9
Limited amount of experience	13	33.3

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

**Table 65**  
**Matthew Christian**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	46	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.8
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	13	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.3
Other personal contacts	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0

**Table 66**  
**Patrick S. Hammers**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	39	86.7
Professional reputation	4	8.9
Other personal contacts	2	4.4
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	38	97.4
Substantial amount of experience	13	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	17	43.6
Limited amount of experience	9	23.1

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

**Table 67**  
**Patrick S. Hammers**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	45	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	38	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	13	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	9	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.1
Professional reputation	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Table 68**  
**Nathaniel Peters**  
**Description of Respondents' Experience**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	13	92.9
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	7.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	13	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	46.2
Moderate amount of experience	5	38.5
Limited amount of experience	2	15.4

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

**Table 69**  
**Nathaniel Peters**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall Evaluation</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	14	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	13	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8
Limited amount of experience	2	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0