



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Kenai Superior Court**

### **Technical Report**

Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional  
Rosylind 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: Roberta C. Erwin: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Roberta C. Erwin: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Martin C. Fallon: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	18
Table 14: Martin C. Fallon: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Jason Gist: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Jason Gist: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 17: Hatton Greer: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	22
Table 18: Hatton Greer: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Scot H. Leaders: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	24
Table 20: Scot H. Leaders: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 21: Daniel Schally: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	26
Table 22: Daniel Schally: Detailed Responses .....	27
Table 23: Samuel D. Scott: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	28
Table 24: Samuel D. Scott: Detailed Responses.....	29
Table 25: Shawn Traini: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	30
Table 26: Shawn Traini: Detailed Responses .....	31

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for 1 judicial vacancy on the Kenai Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge Charles T. Huguelet. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of 8 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Roberta C. Erwin, Martin C. Fallon, Jason Gist, Hatton Greer, Scot H. Leaders, Daniel Schally, Samuel D. Scott, and Shawn Traini.

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

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

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

	<i>n</i>	<b>Professional Competence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Suitability of Experience</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall Rating</b> <i>M</i>
<b>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	82	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	71	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	113	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	62	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	114	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	165	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	38	3.1	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	72	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0

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

# Judicial Selection Survey: Kenai Superior Court

## *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 Kenai Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge Charles T. Huguelet. By the application deadline, the Council had received total of 8 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Roberta C. Erwin, Martin C. Fallon, Jason Gist, Hatton Greer, Scot H. Leaders, Daniel Schally, Samuel D. Scott, and Shawn Traini.

## *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	Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant		
		<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 11-26 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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	102	10.6	80.4	16.7	2.9
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	79	8.2	89.9	10.1	-
<b>Jason Gist</b>	121	12.6	93.4	5.8	0.8
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	81	8.4	76.5	17.3	6.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	131	13.6	87.0	11.5	1.5
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	199	20.7	82.9	14.1	3.0
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	40	4.2	95.0	5.0	-
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	80	8.3	90.0	8.8	1.3

**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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	100	3.5	4.0	1.1	80	3.4	3.5	1.1
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	76	3.8	4.0	1.0	69	3.8	4.0	1.0
<b>Jason Gist</b>	119	4.0	4.0	1.0	112	4.0	4.0	1.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	76	3.3	3.0	1.3	60	3.2	3.0	1.3
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	129	3.9	4.0	1.3	112	3.9	4.0	1.3
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	198	4.5	5.0	0.8	165	4.5	5.0	0.8
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	40	2.6	2.0	1.1	38	2.6	2.0	1.1
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	78	3.9	4.0	1.1	69	4.0	4.0	1.1

**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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	80	5	6.3	12	15.0	23	28.8	26	32.5	14	17.5
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	69	1	1.4	5	7.2	20	29.0	24	34.8	19	27.5
<b>Jason Gist</b>	112	3	2.7	7	6.3	17	15.2	44	39.3	41	36.6
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	60	3	5.0	23	38.3	10	16.7	9	15.0	15	25.0
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	112	6	5.4	16	14.3	11	9.8	26	23.2	53	47.3
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	165	-	-	5	3.0	13	7.9	38	23.0	109	66.1
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	38	5	13.2	15	39.5	10	26.3	6	15.8	2	5.3
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	69	2	2.9	5	7.2	12	17.4	22	31.9	28	40.6

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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	27	3.6	18	3.3	4	3.3	-	-	15	3.5	7	2.3	3	3.7	2	4.0	2	4.0	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	10	3.9	9	3.6	5	3.8	-	-	14	4.1	28	3.8	1	3.0	1	4.0	1	3.0	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	11	3.5	7	3.6	6	3.8	-	-	9	4.1	70	4.1	1	4.0	2	3.0	5	4.4	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	6	4.2	5	2.6	4	2.5	-	-	9	2.7	30	3.3	3	4.7	-	-	2	2.0	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	14	3.6	9	3.3	7	3.3	2	4.5	8	3.5	55	4.1	1	2.0	3	5.0	11	4.4	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	17	4.5	18	4.8	10	4.9	1	4.0	36	4.6	60	4.5	2	4.5	3	4.7	16	4.0	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	2	2.0	6	2.3	1	1.0	-	-	5	3.0	21	2.7	1	3.0	1	2.0	1	3.0	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	12	3.8	3	3.3	5	4.4	-	-	11	4.0	34	4.1	1	4.0	2	2.5	1	5.0	4.0

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>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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	3	3.7	3	3.7	3	2.7	5	2.8	57	3.5	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	5	3.8	15	3.7	18	3.8	3	3.7	24	3.9	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	13	4.2	29	4.2	21	3.8	10	3.6	36	4.0	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	6	3.7	10	3.1	16	3.1	5	3.4	19	2.9	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	7	3.9	15	3.9	21	3.7	15	3.9	45	4.1	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	10	4.9	24	4.7	26	4.7	9	4.4	89	4.4	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	5	2.6	6	2.3	7	2.3	4	2.3	16	2.9	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	9	3.6	12	4.1	11	3.8	6	4.2	30	4.1	4.0

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

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

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	-	-	6	3.2	27	3.5	41	3.3	6	3.7	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	13	3.4	12	3.8	27	3.9	14	4.1	2	4.0	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	42	4.3	28	3.8	23	3.7	11	4.0	6	4.2	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	12	2.8	14	3.7	20	2.9	12	3.6	1	2.0	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	37	4.6	16	3.2	33	3.5	19	3.9	6	3.8	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	33	4.5	16	4.6	75	4.5	30	4.6	10	4.6	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	9	3.0	9	2.4	13	2.4	4	2.8	3	2.7	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	19	4.4	13	3.5	28	3.9	7	4.0	1	5.0	4.0

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>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	1	4.0	-	-	76	3.4	2	3.0	-	-	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	3	3.3	1	5.0	62	3.8	2	3.5	1	4.0	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	2	4.0	1	4.0	105	4.0	3	3.7	-	-	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	1	4.0	7	3.3	47	3.2	3	3.0	1	1.0	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	7	4.0	1	5.0	92	3.9	7	4.0	4	4.5	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	10	4.3	3	5.0	136	4.5	14	4.5	2	5.0	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	3	2.0	-	-	34	2.7	-	-	1	1.0	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	2	4.0	1	3.0	64	4.0	1	3.0	-	-	4.0

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



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

	Male		Female		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Roberta C. Erwin</b>	45	3.6	33	3.1	3.4
<b>Martin C. Fallon</b>	37	3.7	31	3.9	3.8
<b>Jason Gist</b>	76	4.0	34	4.2	4.0
<b>Hatton Greer</b>	34	3.2	24	3.2	3.2
<b>Scot H. Leaders</b>	65	4.1	44	3.8	3.9
<b>Daniel Schally</b>	103	4.5	59	4.6	4.5
<b>Samuel D. Scott</b>	19	2.5	18	2.8	2.6
<b>Shawn Traini</b>	43	3.9	24	4.3	4.0

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

**Table 11**  
**Roberta C. Erwin**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	82	80.4
Professional reputation	17	16.7
Other personal contacts	3	2.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	64	78.0
Substantial amount of experience	24	29.3
Moderate amount of experience	32	39.0
Limited amount of experience	26	31.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.9
Private, solo	39	37.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	21	20.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	17.5
Government	9	8.7
Public service agency or organization	3	2.9
Retired	2	1.9
Other	5	4.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	14	13.6
5 years or fewer	3	2.9
6 to 10 years	3	2.9
11 to 15 years	3	2.9
16 to 20 years	5	4.9
More than 20 years	75	72.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.0
Prosecution	1	1.0
Criminal	8	7.8
Mixed criminal & civil	35	34.0
Civil	51	49.5
Other	7	6.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.9
First District	2	1.9
Second District	-	-
Third District	97	94.2
Fourth District	2	1.9
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	2.9
Male	61	59.2
Female	39	37.9

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

**Table 12**  
**Roberta C. Erwin**  
**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	102	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	64	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	13	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5
Substantial amount of experience	24	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4
Moderate amount of experience	32	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3
Limited amount of experience	26	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
Professional reputation	17	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.8
Other personal contacts	3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	28	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	19	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.5
Government	7	2.6	2.9	3.0	2.4	2.6	2.3
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Retired	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	4.3	3.7	3.3	3.0	4.0	3.7
6 to 10 years	3	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
11 to 15 years	3	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.7
16 to 20 years	5	3.6	3.2	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.8
More than 20 years	57	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	6	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	28	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5
Civil	41	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.3
Other	6	3.8	4.2	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	78	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.4
Fourth District	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	47	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
Female	33	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.1

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

**Table 13**  
**Martin C. Fallon**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	71	89.9
Professional reputation	8	10.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	63	88.7
Substantial amount of experience	24	33.8
Moderate amount of experience	33	46.5
Limited amount of experience	13	18.3
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	12	15.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	12.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	6.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	21.5
Government	32	40.5
Public service agency or organization	1	1.3
Retired	1	1.3
Other	1	1.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	5.1
5 years or fewer	6	7.6
6 to 10 years	15	19.0
11 to 15 years	20	25.3
16 to 20 years	4	5.1
More than 20 years	30	38.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.3
Prosecution	15	19.0
Criminal	13	16.5
Mixed criminal & civil	29	36.7
Civil	17	21.5
Other	4	5.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.8
Second District	1	1.3
Third District	72	91.1
Fourth District	2	2.5
Outside Alaska	1	1.3
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	1.3
Male	41	51.9
Female	37	46.8

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

**Table 14**  
**Martin C. Fallon**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	79	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	63	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	8	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	24	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.0	3.8
Moderate amount of experience	33	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	13	3.5	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.7
Professional reputation	8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	11	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.7	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.6	4.6	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.1
Government	29	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.4	3.9	3.8
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Retired	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	6	4.0	4.4	3.8	4.6	4.4	3.8
6 to 10 years	15	3.5	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.7
11 to 15 years	18	3.7	4.1	3.9	4.4	3.7	3.8
16 to 20 years	3	3.7	4.3	3.7	4.7	4.3	3.7
More than 20 years	25	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.9
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	13	3.2	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.5	3.4
Criminal	12	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.9
Civil	15	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.6	3.9	4.1
Other	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	3	3.7	4.7	3.7	4.3	4.3	3.3
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	64	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.8
Fourth District	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	39	3.7	4.4	4.2	4.4	3.8	3.7
Female	31	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.0	3.9

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

**Table 15**  
**Jason Gist**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	113	93.4
Professional reputation	7	5.8
Other personal contacts	1	.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	106	93.8
Substantial amount of experience	58	51.3
Moderate amount of experience	44	38.9
Limited amount of experience	11	9.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.8
Private, solo	13	10.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	5.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	7.4
Government	76	62.8
Public service agency or organization	1	.8
Retired	3	2.5
Other	5	4.1
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	3	2.5
5 years or fewer	14	11.6
6 to 10 years	34	28.1
11 to 15 years	23	19.0
16 to 20 years	11	9.1
More than 20 years	36	29.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	2	1.7
Prosecution	44	36.4
Criminal	32	26.4
Mixed criminal & civil	24	19.8
Civil	13	10.7
Other	6	5.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	.8
First District	2	1.7
Second District	2	1.7
Third District	112	92.6
Fourth District	4	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	1.7
Male	79	65.3
Female	40	33.1

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

**Table 16**  
**Jason Gist**  
**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	121	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	106	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	7	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
Substantial amount of experience	58	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	44	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7
Limited amount of experience	11	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8
Professional reputation	7	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.6	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	11	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.0	4.1
Government	71	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Retired	2	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other	5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.4
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	13	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
6 to 10 years	29	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2
11 to 15 years	22	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8
16 to 20 years	10	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.6
More than 20 years	36	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	43	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3
Criminal	28	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	23	3.7	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.7
Civil	11	3.9	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
Other	6	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	3.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0
Third District	105	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	77	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0
Female	34	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2

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

**Table 17**  
**Hatton Greer**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	62	76.5
Professional reputation	14	17.3
Other personal contacts	5	6.2
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	52	83.9
Substantial amount of experience	32	51.6
Moderate amount of experience	17	27.4
Limited amount of experience	13	21.0
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.2
Private, solo	11	13.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	7.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	12.3
Government	41	50.6
Public service agency or organization	5	6.2
Retired	-	-
Other	3	3.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	7	8.6
5 years or fewer	9	11.1
6 to 10 years	14	17.3
11 to 15 years	20	24.7
16 to 20 years	5	6.2
More than 20 years	26	32.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.2
Prosecution	12	14.8
Criminal	23	28.4
Mixed criminal & civil	26	32.1
Civil	16	19.8
Other	3	3.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.2
First District	2	2.5
Second District	7	8.6
Third District	65	80.2
Fourth District	5	6.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	2.5
Male	47	58.0
Female	32	39.5

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



**Table 18**  
**Hatton Greer**  
**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	81	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	52	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.2
Experience not within last 5 years	9	2.9	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	32	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	17	3.2	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.2
Limited amount of experience	13	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0
Professional reputation	14	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7
Other personal contacts	5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	6	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.4	2.8	2.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	2.3	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.5	2.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.7
Government	32	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.3
Public service agency or organization	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.7
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	6	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.7
6 to 10 years	11	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.1
11 to 15 years	16	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.3	3.1
16 to 20 years	5	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.4
More than 20 years	20	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	12	2.6	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.8
Criminal	15	3.7	4.2	4.0	3.6	4.1	3.7
Mixed criminal & civil	20	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9
Civil	13	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	7	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3
Third District	49	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.2
Fourth District	3	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	34	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.2
Female	26	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.2

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

**Table 19**  
**Scot H. Leaders**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	114	87.0
Professional reputation	15	11.5
Other personal contacts	2	1.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	92	80.7
Substantial amount of experience	53	46.5
Moderate amount of experience	35	30.7
Limited amount of experience	26	22.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.5
Private, solo	15	11.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	6.1
Private, corporate employee	3	2.3
Judge or judicial officer	12	9.2
Government	64	48.9
Public service agency or organization	1	.8
Retired	3	2.3
Other	13	9.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	10	7.6
5 years or fewer	8	6.1
6 to 10 years	19	14.5
11 to 15 years	25	19.1
16 to 20 years	17	13.0
More than 20 years	52	39.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	2	1.5
Prosecution	42	32.1
Criminal	19	14.5
Mixed criminal & civil	36	27.5
Civil	24	18.3
Other	8	6.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	.8
First District	9	6.9
Second District	2	1.5
Third District	107	81.7
Fourth District	8	6.1
Outside Alaska	4	3.1
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	2.3
Male	78	59.5
Female	50	38.2

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

**Table 20**  
**Scot H. Leaders**  
**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	131	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	92	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	20	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	53	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	35	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.7
Limited amount of experience	26	4.0	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.9
Professional reputation	15	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.5
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.0	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.5
Government	55	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Retired	3	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0
Other	13	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.6	3.9
6 to 10 years	15	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.9
11 to 15 years	21	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7
16 to 20 years	15	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9
More than 20 years	47	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	37	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
Criminal	16	3.9	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	33	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5
Civil	20	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9
Other	7	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.3	3.8
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	8	4.6	3.9	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	93	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9
Fourth District	7	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
Outside Alaska	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	66	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1
Female	45	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.8

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

**Table 21**  
**Daniel Schally**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	165	82.9
Professional reputation	28	14.1
Other personal contacts	6	3.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	134	81.2
Substantial amount of experience	35	21.2
Moderate amount of experience	70	42.4
Limited amount of experience	58	35.2
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.0
Private, solo	21	10.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	21	10.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	5.5
Private, corporate employee	3	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	46	23.1
Government	69	34.7
Public service agency or organization	3	1.5
Retired	4	2.0
Other	19	9.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	9	4.5
5 years or fewer	12	6.0
6 to 10 years	26	13.1
11 to 15 years	30	15.1
16 to 20 years	13	6.5
More than 20 years	109	54.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	.5
Prosecution	35	17.6
Criminal	23	11.6
Mixed criminal & civil	88	44.2
Civil	39	19.6
Other	13	6.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	16	8.0
Second District	5	2.5
Third District	158	79.4
Fourth District	17	8.5
Outside Alaska	3	1.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	3	1.5
Male	126	63.3
Female	70	35.2

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

**Table 22**  
**Daniel Schally**  
**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	199	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	134	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	27	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	35	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	70	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Limited amount of experience	58	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4
Professional reputation	28	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3
Other personal contacts	6	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	17	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	36	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.6
Government	60	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5
Retired	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.3	5.0	4.7
Other	16	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	10	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
6 to 10 years	24	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7
11 to 15 years	26	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7
16 to 20 years	9	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
More than 20 years	89	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	33	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Criminal	16	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	75	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
Civil	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Other	10	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.7	4.6
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	10	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3
Second District	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	136	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5
Fourth District	14	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	103	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5
Female	59	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.6

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

**Table 23**  
**Samuel D. Scott**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	38	95.0
Professional reputation	2	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	92.1
Substantial amount of experience	20	52.6
Moderate amount of experience	8	21.1
Limited amount of experience	10	26.3
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	7.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	15.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	12.5
Government	22	55.0
Public service agency or organization	1	2.5
Retired	1	2.5
Other	1	2.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	5	12.5
6 to 10 years	6	15.0
11 to 15 years	9	22.5
16 to 20 years	4	10.0
More than 20 years	16	40.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	9	22.5
Criminal	9	22.5
Mixed criminal & civil	13	32.5
Civil	5	12.5
Other	4	10.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	3	7.5
Second District	-	-
Third District	36	90.0
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	2.5
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	2.5
Male	19	47.5
Female	20	50.0

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

**Table 24**  
**Samuel D. Scott**  
**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	40	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	35	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7
Experience not within last 5 years	2	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Substantial amount of experience	20	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.3
Moderate amount of experience	8	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.8
Limited amount of experience	10	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1
Professional reputation	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	2.5	2.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	2	2.5	3.0	2.0	1.5	3.0	2.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.0	3.0
Government	21	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.7
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Retired	1	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Other	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	3.4	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.6	2.6
6 to 10 years	6	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.3
11 to 15 years	7	2.9	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3
16 to 20 years	4	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.8	2.3
More than 20 years	16	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.1	2.9
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	9	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.0
Criminal	9	2.8	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.4
Mixed criminal & civil	13	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.4
Civil	4	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	2.8	2.8
Other	3	3.0	3.7	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	3	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	34	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	19	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.5
Female	18	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8

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

**Table 25**  
**Shawn Traini**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	72	90.0
Professional reputation	7	8.8
Other personal contacts	1	1.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	65	90.3
Substantial amount of experience	39	54.2
Moderate amount of experience	23	31.9
Limited amount of experience	9	12.5
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.2
Private, solo	13	16.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	6.2
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2
Judge or judicial officer	12	14.8
Government	41	50.6
Public service agency or organization	1	1.2
Retired	2	2.5
Other	2	2.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	2.5
5 years or fewer	10	12.3
6 to 10 years	15	18.5
11 to 15 years	13	16.0
16 to 20 years	8	9.9
More than 20 years	33	40.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.2
Prosecution	21	25.9
Criminal	15	18.5
Mixed criminal & civil	32	39.5
Civil	11	13.6
Other	1	1.2
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.2
First District	2	2.5
Second District	1	1.2
Third District	75	92.6
Fourth District	2	2.5
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	2.5
Male	50	61.7
Female	29	35.8

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



**Table 26**  
**Shawn Traini**  
**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	80	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	65	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	39	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	23	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7
Limited amount of experience	9	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.9
Professional reputation	7	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	11	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.5	4.0
Government	36	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	2.5
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	10	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
6 to 10 years	13	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1
11 to 15 years	11	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8
16 to 20 years	6	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2
More than 20 years	31	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	20	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Criminal	13	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	30	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.9
Civil	7	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.0
Other	1	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Third District	66	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	44	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
Female	26	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3

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