



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Alaska Court of Appeals**

### **Technical Report**

Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional  
Rosylnd Frazier, M.S., Senior Research Professional  
Jessica Passini, B.S., Research Professional

*September 28, 2018*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

<https://iseralaska.org/>

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation .....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management .....	6
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants .....	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings .....	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating .....	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice .....	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice .....	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled .....	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice .....	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender .....	15
<i>Applicant Tables</i>	
Table 11: Bethany Harbison: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	16
Table 12: Bethany Harbison: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Douglas Owen Moody: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	18
Table 14: Douglas Owen Moody: Detailed Responses .....	19
Table 15: Philip Pallenberg: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Philip Pallenberg: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 17: Eric Ringsmuth: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Eric Ringsmuth: Detailed Responses .....	23
Table 19: Michael R. Smith: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Michael R. Smith: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 21: Timothy W. Terrell: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	26
Table 22: Timothy W. Terrell: Detailed Responses .....	27

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for 1 judicial vacancy on the Alaska Court of Appeals created by the retirement of Judge David Mannheimer. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of 6 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Bethany Harbison, Douglas Owen Moody, Philip Pallenberg, Eric Ringsmuth, Michael R. Smith, and Timothy W. Terrell.

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

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

**Table 1**  
**Mean Ratings of Applicants**

		<b>Professional Competence</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Fairness</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Suitability of Experience</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	156	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	162	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	185	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	85	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	68	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	128	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5

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

# Judicial Selection Survey: Alaska Court of Appeals

## *Introduction*

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

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Alaska Court of Appeals, Juneau Superior Court, Utqiagvik Superior Court<sup>1</sup>, Kenai Superior Court, and Bethel Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for Alaska Court of Appeals, created by the retirement of Judge David Mannheimer. By the application deadline, the Council had received total of 6 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Bethany Harbison, Douglas Owen Moody, Philip Pallenberg, Eric Ringsmuth, Michael R. Smith, and Timothy W. Terrell.

## *Methodology*

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,263 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,239) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Twenty-four individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 37 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 982 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; 35 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question. No online surveys were returned by individuals who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 947 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 20 paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because they were unsigned. Four paper surveys were excluded because the respondents did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, 16 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 947 online surveys and 16 paper surveys, for a total of 963 surveys and a survey return rate of 29.5%. Of the 963 returned surveys, 290 did not rate any of the 26 applicants (six Alaska Court of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Utqiagvik Superior Court selection was later cancelled and re-advertised by the Alaska Judicial Council.

Appeals applicants, six Juneau Superior Court applicants, two Utqiagvik Superior Court applicants, eight Kenai Superior Court applicants, four Bethel Superior Court applicants; 673 (69.9%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

**Table 2**  
**Respondent Characteristics**

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
		<b>963</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>					
	No response	21	2.2	8	1.2
	Private, solo	186	19.3	115	17.1
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	117	12.1	84	12.5
	Private, 6+ attorneys	80	8.3	42	6.2
	Private, corporate employee	19	2.0	9	1.3
	Judge or judicial officer	100	10.4	87	12.9
	Government	286	29.7	224	33.3
	Public service agency or organization	30	3.1	23	3.4
	Retired	28	2.9	19	2.8
	Other	96	10.0	62	9.2
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>					
	No response	74	7.7	41	6.1
	5 years or fewer	119	12.4	81	12.0
	6 to 10 years	125	13.0	99	14.7
	11 to 15 years	103	10.7	82	12.2
	16 to 20 years	84	8.7	51	7.6
	More than 20 years	458	47.6	319	47.4
<b>Cases Handled</b>					
	No response	24	2.5	8	1.2
	Prosecution	90	9.3	83	12.3
	Criminal	102	10.6	91	13.5
	Mixed criminal & civil	224	23.3	189	28.1
	Civil	434	45.1	251	37.3
	Other	89	9.2	51	7.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>					
	No response	23	2.4	8	1.2
	First District	122	12.7	110	16.3
	Second District	24	2.5	20	3.0
	Third District	646	67.1	432	64.2
	Fourth District	101	10.5	85	12.6
	Outside Alaska	47	4.9	18	2.7
<b>Gender</b>					
	No response	25	2.6	8	1.2
	Male	565	58.7	389	57.8
	Female	373	38.7	276	41.0

## *Instrumentation*

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant. Some applicants applied for more than one vacancy; in these cases, the six evaluation items and space for comments appeared separately for each vacancy and respondents were asked to rate the applicant and comment based on each specific vacancy.

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

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

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

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

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

## *Confidentiality and Data Safety*

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

## ***Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding***

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

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

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

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

## ***Data Management***

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

## ***Results***

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

### ***Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant***

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

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



## *Ratings of Applicants*

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-22 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

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

	<i>n</i>	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...			
		% of all respondents who rated applicant	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	197	20.5	79.2	16.2	4.6
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	206	21.4	78.6	13.6	7.8
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	243	25.2	76.1	18.9	4.9
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	94	9.8	90.4	5.3	4.3
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	96	10.0	70.8	11.5	17.7
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	151	15.7	84.8	9.9	5.3

**Table 4**  
**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>Bethany Harbison</b>	190	4.4	5.0	0.8	152	4.4	5.0	0.8
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	204	4.3	5.0	0.9	161	4.3	5.0	0.9
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	241	4.5	5.0	0.9	183	4.4	5.0	1.0
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	91	3.9	4.0	1.2	82	4.0	4.0	1.2
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	90	3.4	3.5	1.3	65	3.2	3.0	1.3
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	148	4.4	5.0	0.8	126	4.5	5.0	0.8

**Table 5**  
***Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating***

	<b>Poor</b>			<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	152	-	-	6	3.9	18	11.8	37	24.3	91	59.9
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	161	2	1.2	7	4.3	21	13.0	36	22.4	95	59.0
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	183	4	2.2	9	4.9	12	6.6	37	20.2	121	66.1
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	82	2	2.4	13	15.9	9	11.0	21	25.6	37	45.1
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	65	3	4.6	23	35.4	10	15.4	15	23.1	14	21.5
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	126	1	0.8	4	3.2	10	7.9	30	23.8	81	64.3

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

**Table 6**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice**

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	13	3.9	17	4.5	8	4.6	-	-	40	4.6	46	4.3	5	4.8	3	3.7	18	4.3	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	17	4.5	8	5.0	7	4.9	2	3.5	26	4.0	84	4.3	5	4.8	3	4.3	7	3.7	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	30	4.2	17	4.5	9	4.1	2	4.5	40	4.4	48	4.6	5	4.6	5	4.6	24	4.3	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	5	3.0	3	4.0	1	5.0	2	4.5	11	3.5	49	4.1	-	-	2	3.5	7	3.9	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	9	4.1	3	4.0	-	-	1	4.0	18	3.4	19	2.4	1	5.0	3	4.0	10	3.0	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	10	4.2	3	2.7	1	5.0	4	4.5	17	4.2	67	4.6	1	3.0	4	4.5	16	4.7	4.5

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

**Table 7**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice**

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	18	4.5	18	4.5	15	4.8	13	4.2	81	4.3	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	12	5.0	32	4.6	27	4.5	17	4.1	64	4.1	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	3	4.7	18	4.4	19	4.7	11	3.8	115	4.4	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	3	4.3	17	4.2	17	4.0	13	3.9	26	3.8	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	1	2.0	6	2.2	5	3.6	5	3.6	45	3.4	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	6	5.0	21	4.6	17	4.5	19	4.8	57	4.2	4.5

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

**Table 8**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled**

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	19	4.1	18	4.1	69	4.5	32	4.5	13	4.5	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	18	3.4	53	4.7	57	4.4	20	4.2	11	4.3	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	13	4.5	16	4.5	61	4.3	70	4.5	19	4.5	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	29	4.4	24	3.3	14	3.8	8	4.4	5	4.2	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	10	2.1	11	2.9	29	3.4	7	4.4	6	3.7	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	40	4.8	25	4.3	33	4.3	12	4.7	13	4.2	4.5

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

**Table 9**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice**

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	5	4.6	5	4.2	71	4.2	66	4.6	2	5.0	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	9	4.4	5	5.0	127	4.3	14	4.4	3	4.7	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	80	4.6	1	5.0	82	4.2	12	4.3	4	4.8	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	3	4.3	1	5.0	71	4.0	4	3.3	-	-	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	1	4.0	2	4.5	58	3.2	-	-	1	5.0	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	5	4.2	3	5.0	103	4.4	8	4.4	3	5.0	4.5

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



**Table 10**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Gender**

	Male		Female		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Bethany Harbison</b>	77	4.5	71	4.3	4.4
<b>Douglas Owen Moody</b>	93	4.5	64	4.2	4.3
<b>Philip Pallenberg</b>	97	4.4	82	4.5	4.4
<b>Eric Ringsmuth</b>	47	4.1	33	3.8	4.0
<b>Michael R. Smith</b>	34	3.3	29	3.2	3.2
<b>Timothy W. Terrell</b>	74	4.5	48	4.4	4.5

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

**Table 11**  
**Bethany Harbison**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	156	79.2
Professional reputation	32	16.2
Other personal contacts	9	4.6
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	141	90.4
Substantial amount of experience	60	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	59	37.8
Limited amount of experience	36	23.1
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.0
Private, solo	23	11.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	19	9.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	48	24.4
Government	59	29.9
Public service agency or organization	7	3.6
Retired	5	2.5
Other	25	12.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	10	5.1
5 years or fewer	21	10.7
6 to 10 years	20	10.2
11 to 15 years	20	10.2
16 to 20 years	17	8.6
More than 20 years	109	55.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	2	1.0
Prosecution	23	11.7
Criminal	24	12.2
Mixed criminal & civil	83	42.1
Civil	50	25.4
Other	15	7.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	4	2.0
First District	11	5.6
Second District	6	3.0
Third District	99	50.3
Fourth District	74	37.6
Outside Alaska	3	1.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	4	2.0
Male	102	51.8
Female	91	46.2

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

**Table 12**  
**Bethany Harbison**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	197	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	141	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	13	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	60	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	59	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	36	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	32	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Other personal contacts	9	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	4.2	4.2	3.7	4.3	4.0	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	40	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Government	48	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3
Public service agency or organization	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8
Retired	4	4.0	4.3	3.5	4.3	3.7	3.7
Other	18	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	19	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	19	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
11 to 15 years	15	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.8
16 to 20 years	13	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2
More than 20 years	83	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	20	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.1
Criminal	19	4.3	4.6	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.1
Mixed criminal & civil	71	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
Civil	32	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Other	13	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	4.4	4.6	4.4	5.0	4.6	4.6
Second District	5	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.2
Third District	73	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	68	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6
Outside Alaska	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	80	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.5
Female	72	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.3

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

**Table 13**  
**Douglas Owen Moody**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	162	78.6
Professional reputation	28	13.6
Other personal contacts	16	7.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	127	78.4
Substantial amount of experience	70	43.2
Moderate amount of experience	62	38.3
Limited amount of experience	28	17.3
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	4	1.9
Private, solo	27	13.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	5.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	4.9
Private, corporate employee	4	1.9
Judge or judicial officer	29	14.1
Government	97	47.1
Public service agency or organization	7	3.4
Retired	4	1.9
Other	13	6.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	12	5.8
5 years or fewer	14	6.8
6 to 10 years	35	17.0
11 to 15 years	31	15.0
16 to 20 years	22	10.7
More than 20 years	92	44.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	4	1.9
Prosecution	23	11.2
Criminal	59	28.6
Mixed criminal & civil	64	31.1
Civil	42	20.4
Other	14	6.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	5	2.4
First District	13	6.3
Second District	5	2.4
Third District	164	79.6
Fourth District	15	7.3
Outside Alaska	4	1.9
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	5	2.4
Male	121	58.7
Female	80	38.8

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

**Table 14**  
**Douglas Owen Moody**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	206	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	127	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	31	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
Substantial amount of experience	70	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	62	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	28	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.1
Professional reputation	28	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Other personal contacts	16	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	17	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.9
Private, corporate employee	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Judge or judicial officer	26	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0
Government	84	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.3
Public service agency or organization	5	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.8
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other	8	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	12	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	32	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	27	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.5
16 to 20 years	17	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
More than 20 years	65	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.1
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	18	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.4
Criminal	53	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	57	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Civil	20	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.2
Other	12	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	9	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.6	4.4
Second District	5	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8	5.0
Third District	128	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
Fourth District	14	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.4
Outside Alaska	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	94	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Female	64	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.2

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

**Table 15**  
**Philip Pallenberg**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	185	76.1
Professional reputation	46	18.9
Other personal contacts	12	4.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	150	81.1
Substantial amount of experience	64	34.6
Moderate amount of experience	72	38.9
Limited amount of experience	48	25.9
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	3	1.2
Private, solo	37	15.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	26	10.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	5.3
Private, corporate employee	2	.8
Judge or judicial officer	46	18.9
Government	62	25.5
Public service agency or organization	8	3.3
Retired	9	3.7
Other	37	15.2
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	20	8.2
5 years or fewer	8	3.3
6 to 10 years	21	8.6
11 to 15 years	22	9.1
16 to 20 years	16	6.6
More than 20 years	156	64.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	5	2.1
Prosecution	14	5.8
Criminal	24	9.9
Mixed criminal & civil	75	30.9
Civil	101	41.6
Other	24	9.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	4	1.6
First District	93	38.3
Second District	4	1.6
Third District	119	49.0
Fourth District	17	7.0
Outside Alaska	6	2.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	4	1.6
Male	140	57.6
Female	99	40.7

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

**Table 16**  
**Philip Pallenberg**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	243	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	150	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	32	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	64	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	72	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Limited amount of experience	48	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	46	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Other personal contacts	12	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	30	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	40	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4
Government	50	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.6
Public service agency or organization	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Retired	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.6
Other	24	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7
6 to 10 years	19	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
11 to 15 years	19	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7
16 to 20 years	11	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.1	3.8
More than 20 years	116	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	13	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.7	4.5
Criminal	17	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	62	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Civil	70	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other	19	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	80	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	84	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	12	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
Outside Alaska	4	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	97	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Female	84	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5

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

**Table 17**  
**Eric Ringsmuth**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	85	90.4
Professional reputation	5	5.3
Other personal contacts	4	4.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	67	78.8
Substantial amount of experience	42	49.4
Moderate amount of experience	26	30.6
Limited amount of experience	17	20.0
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	3	3.2
Private, solo	5	5.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	2.1
Private, corporate employee	2	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	14	14.9
Government	55	58.5
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	2	2.1
Other	8	8.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	7	7.4
5 years or fewer	4	4.3
6 to 10 years	18	19.1
11 to 15 years	21	22.3
16 to 20 years	13	13.8
More than 20 years	31	33.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	4	4.3
Prosecution	31	33.0
Criminal	27	28.7
Mixed criminal & civil	15	16.0
Civil	12	12.8
Other	5	5.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	4	4.3
First District	4	4.3
Second District	1	1.1
Third District	80	85.1
Fourth District	4	4.3
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	3.2
Male	55	58.5
Female	36	38.3

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



**Table 18**  
**Eric Ringsmuth**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	94	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	67	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	16	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	42	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	26	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0
Limited amount of experience	17	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	5	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2
Other personal contacts	4	4.3	4.8	4.3	5.0	4.8	4.8
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	5	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.4	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	3.7	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	13	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.5
Government	50	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
Other	7	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	4	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.3
6 to 10 years	17	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2
11 to 15 years	17	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.0
16 to 20 years	13	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.9
More than 20 years	28	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.8
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Criminal	24	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	4.0	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	15	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8
Civil	9	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.0	4.4
Other	5	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	74	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Fourth District	4	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	49	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
Female	34	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.8

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

**Table 19**  
**Michael R. Smith**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	68	70.8
Professional reputation	11	11.5
Other personal contacts	17	17.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	52	76.5
Substantial amount of experience	16	23.5
Moderate amount of experience	30	44.1
Limited amount of experience	22	32.4
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.0
Private, solo	16	16.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	8.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	2.1
Private, corporate employee	1	1.0
Judge or judicial officer	24	25.0
Government	24	25.0
Public service agency or organization	3	3.1
Retired	4	4.2
Other	13	13.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	6	6.3
5 years or fewer	2	2.1
6 to 10 years	8	8.3
11 to 15 years	6	6.3
16 to 20 years	6	6.3
More than 20 years	68	70.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	3	3.1
Prosecution	13	13.5
Criminal	15	15.6
Mixed criminal & civil	39	40.6
Civil	17	17.7
Other	9	9.4
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	3	3.1
First District	2	2.1
Second District	2	2.1
Third District	87	90.6
Fourth District	1	1.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	2.1
Male	52	54.2
Female	42	43.8

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

**Table 20**  
**Michael R. Smith**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	96	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	52	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.1	3.1
Experience not within last 5 years	15	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	16	3.8	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	30	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.1
Limited amount of experience	22	3.6	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.4	3.3
Professional reputation	11	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.9
Other personal contacts	17	3.9	4.5	4.2	4.3	3.7	3.9
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	10	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	18	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.2	3.4
Government	21	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.4	2.4
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.0
Other	10	3.1	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	2	2.0	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.0
6 to 10 years	7	2.3	3.6	3.4	2.8	2.2	2.2
11 to 15 years	5	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.6
16 to 20 years	5	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.6
More than 20 years	46	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	12	2.4	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.1
Criminal	11	3.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.0	2.9
Mixed criminal & civil	30	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.4
Civil	7	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4
Other	6	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.2	3.7	3.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.0
Second District	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Third District	60	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.2
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	35	3.6	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.3
Female	31	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.2

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

**Table 21**  
**Timothy W. Terrell**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	128	84.8
Professional reputation	15	9.9
Other personal contacts	8	5.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	95	74.2
Substantial amount of experience	53	41.4
Moderate amount of experience	38	29.7
Limited amount of experience	36	28.1
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	4	2.6
Private, solo	12	7.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.3
Private, corporate employee	4	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	20	13.2
Government	76	50.3
Public service agency or organization	2	1.3
Retired	4	2.6
Other	19	12.6
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	8	5.3
5 years or fewer	9	6.0
6 to 10 years	24	15.9
11 to 15 years	18	11.9
16 to 20 years	19	12.6
More than 20 years	73	48.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	4	2.6
Prosecution	44	29.1
Criminal	28	18.5
Mixed criminal & civil	38	25.2
Civil	23	15.2
Other	14	9.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	5	3.3
First District	7	4.6
Second District	3	2.0
Third District	123	81.5
Fourth District	9	6.0
Outside Alaska	4	2.6
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	5	3.3
Male	86	57.0
Female	60	39.7

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

**Table 22**  
**Timothy W. Terrell**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	151	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	95	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	32	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	53	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	36	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Professional reputation	15	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.1
Other personal contacts	8	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	10	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.3	2.7	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.2	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2
Government	69	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Retired	4	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
Other	16	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	21	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	17	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
16 to 20 years	19	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
More than 20 years	58	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	41	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8
Criminal	26	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	33	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Civil	12	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7
Other	13	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	4.0	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.4	4.2
Second District	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Third District	105	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4
Fourth District	8	4.6	5.0	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	74	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Female	50	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4

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