



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Bethel District Court**

### **Technical Report**

Maia Wen, B.A., Research Professional  
Katelyn Saft, Undergraduate Research Assistant  
Stacy Tanner, B.A., Graduate Research Assistant  
Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Associate Professor

*April 17, 2018*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

<http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs/>

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
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.....	11
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled.....	12
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice.....	13
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender .....	14
<i>Applicant Tables</i>	
Table 11: Terrence P. Haas: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	15
Table 12: Terrence P. Haas: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 13: Melony P. Lockwood: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	17
Table 14: Melony P. Lockwood: Detailed Responses.....	18
Table 15: Tara Logsdon: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	19
Table 16: Tara Logsdon: Detailed Responses.....	20
Table 17: Michael Sean McLaughlin: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	21
Table 18: Michael Sean McLaughlin: Detailed Responses .....	22
Table 19: Will Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	23
Table 20: Will Montgomery: Detailed Responses .....	24
Table 21: Heather O’Brien: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	25
Table 22: Heather O’Brien: Detailed Responses.....	26
Table 23: David L. Roghair: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	27
Table 24: David L. Roghair: Detailed Responses .....	28

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Bethel District Court created by the appointment of Judge Nathaniel Peters to the Bethel Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) received a total of 8 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Terrence P. Haas, Melony P. Lockwood, Tara Logsdon, Michael Sean McLaughlin, Will Montgomery, Heather O’Brien, John O. Putikka, and David L. Roghair. John O. Putikka withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

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 Rating for this Position*. 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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	60	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	51	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	60	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	48	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	43	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.6
<b>Heather O’Brien</b>	69	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	47	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8

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

# Judicial Selection Survey: Bethel District 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 Rating for this Position*. 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 Center for Behavioral Health Research and Services (CBHRS), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. CBHRS was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Judicial Council but were returned directly to CBHRS for processing, data entry, and analysis. CBHRS prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Anchorage Superior Court, Bethel Superior Court, Fairbanks Superior Court, Juneau Superior Court, Kenai Superior Court, and Bethel District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for the Bethel District Court, created by the appointment of Judge Nathaniel Peters to the Bethel Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Council had received a total of 8 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Terrence P. Haas, Melony P. Lockwood, Tara Logsdon, Michael Sean McLaughlin, Will Montgomery, Heather O'Brien, John O. Putikka, and David L. Roghair. John O. Putikka withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

## *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 3,367 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,295) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Thirty-two individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 40 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 939 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; 34 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, 905 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 24 paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. One paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned. Five paper surveys were excluded either because the respondents answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2 or because they left that question blank. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, 18 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 905 online surveys and 18 paper surveys, for a total of 923 surveys and a survey return rate of 27.4%. Of the 923 returned surveys, 165 did not rate any of the 62 applicants (19 Anchorage Superior Court applicants, seven Bethel Superior Court applicants, ten Fairbanks Superior Court applicants, ten Juneau Superior Court applicants, eight Kenai Superior Court applicants, and eight Bethel District Court applicants); 758 (82.1%) 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>923</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
		<b>758</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Type of Practice</b>				
No response	14	1.5	5	0.7
Private, solo	190	20.6	150	19.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	152	16.5	126	16.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	105	11.4	85	11.2
Private, corporate employee	24	2.6	16	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	83	9.0	78	10.3
Government	262	28.4	226	29.8
Public service agency or organization	35	3.8	29	3.8
Retired	49	5.3	35	4.6
Other	9	1.0	8	1.1
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>				
No response	45	4.9	28	3.7
5 years or fewer	117	12.7	92	12.1
6 to 10 years	108	11.7	90	11.9
11 to 15 years	98	10.6	83	10.9
16 to 20 years	107	11.6	89	11.7
More than 20 years	448	48.5	376	49.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>				
No response	17	1.8	11	1.5
Prosecution	58	6.3	55	7.3
Criminal	76	8.2	68	9.0
Mixed criminal & civil	217	23.5	191	25.2
Civil	494	53.5	391	51.6
Other	61	6.6	42	5.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>				
No response	15	1.6	6	0.8
First District	118	12.8	99	13.1
Second District	9	1.0	6	0.8
Third District	627	67.9	519	68.5
Fourth District	118	12.8	109	14.4
Outside Alaska	36	3.9	19	2.5
<b>Gender</b>				
No response	26	2.8	14	1.8
Male	529	57.3	424	55.9
Female	368	39.9	320	42.2

## *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 CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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. One paper survey was returned that had no signed name on the outside of the envelope and no signed comments. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis and was not reflected in the total number of valid surveys received. 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, and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. After merging online and entered paper data, CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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. Before entry, all paper data was reviewed and cleaned prior to data entry. Then, a second staff member confirmed all data cleaning and entered the surveys. After the paper surveys were entered, the first staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes. 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. Second, ratings and comparisons of the applicants are provided in a variety of ways. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on a very small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results for the applicant.

### ***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 Rating* 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 11-24 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>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b>Terrence P. Haas</b>	69	7.5	87.0	11.6	1.4
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	57	6.2	89.5	10.5	-
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	77	8.3	77.9	14.3	7.8
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	62	6.7	77.4	17.7	4.8
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	52	5.6	82.7	13.5	3.8
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	85	9.2	81.2	10.6	8.2
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	57	6.2	82.5	12.3	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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	67	4.4	5.0	1.0	58	4.3	5.0	1.0
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	55	3.8	4.0	1.2	50	3.8	4.0	1.2
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	77	3.7	4.0	1.2	60	3.9	4.0	1.2
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	62	4.4	5.0	0.8	48	4.5	5.0	0.7
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	52	3.7	4.0	1.4	43	3.6	4.0	1.4
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	85	4.1	5.0	1.1	69	4.1	5.0	1.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	55	3.9	4.0	1.2	45	3.8	4.0	1.2

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

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Terrence P. Haas</b>	58	-	-	6	10.3	7	12.1	9	15.5	36	62.1
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	50	1	2.0	9	18.0	7	14.0	13	26.0	20	40.0
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	60	2	3.3	7	11.7	10	16.7	18	30.0	23	38.3
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	48	-	-	-	-	6	12.5	14	29.2	28	58.3
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	43	4	9.3	8	18.6	7	16.3	8	18.6	16	37.2
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	69	3	4.3	4	5.8	9	13.0	18	26.1	35	50.7
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	45	2	4.4	5	11.1	8	17.8	14	31.1	16	35.6

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		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>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Terrence P. Haas</b>	3	3.3	5	4.2	1	5.0	-	-	10	4.3	33	4.3	6	4.5	-	-	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	4	4.3	11	3.5	3	4.7	-	-	9	4.2	13	3.1	7	4.7	1	5.0	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	17	3.9	9	3.0	2	4.5	1	4.0	15	4.3	13	4.1	-	-	3	3.0	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	7	4.6	4	4.3	5	3.4	2	4.0	6	4.7	18	4.6	-	-	5	4.8	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	2	3.5	5	3.0	1	1.0	-	-	10	4.0	22	3.6	2	3.5	1	4.0	3.6
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	9	4.3	3	5.0	3	4.7	1	4.0	15	3.5	34	4.2	1	5.0	2	3.5	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	8	3.5	5	3.2	2	4.5	-	-	11	3.7	18	4.1	1	5.0	-	-	3.8

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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	12	3.5	11	4.8	8	4.5	9	4.2	17	4.5	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	7	3.4	9	4.1	9	3.3	7	4.3	16	4.0	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	4	4.0	6	3.3	8	4.1	9	3.7	32	4.0	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	1	5.0	2	4.5	2	4.5	8	4.6	31	4.4	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	11	3.7	7	3.1	6	3.7	4	3.3	14	3.6	3.6
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	10	4.4	7	4.3	5	4.4	9	4.3	34	4.0	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	9	4.1	5	4.2	5	3.8	7	4.1	18	3.4	3.8

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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	6	2.7	11	4.9	26	4.5	13	4.5	2	2.5	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	3	2.3	3	3.3	20	3.7	24	4.3	-	-	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	-	-	5	2.4	30	4.1	23	3.9	1	4.0	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	11	4.7	5	4.6	11	4.2	15	4.3	4	4.8	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	4	4.3	4	4.3	23	4.0	11	2.3	1	2.0	3.6
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	10	4.1	16	4.2	25	4.2	16	3.9	2	4.5	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	2	4.5	3	4.7	25	3.4	15	4.2	-	-	3.8

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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	2	4.0	1	3.0	26	4.5	28	4.1	1	5.0	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	1	5.0	-	-	8	4.1	40	3.7	1	5.0	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	-	-	-	-	58	3.9	1	5.0	1	1.0	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	2	4.0	-	-	40	4.5	4	4.0	1	5.0	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	1	2.0	1	4.0	11	2.6	29	4.0	1	1.0	3.6
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	3	4.3	-	-	57	4.1	8	4.5	1	5.0	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	2	3.5	2	3.0	12	3.8	28	4.0	1	2.0	3.8

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>Terrence P. Haas</b>	26	4.3	32	4.3	4.3
<b>Melony P. Lockwood</b>	25	4.0	25	3.7	3.8
<b>Tara Logsdon</b>	30	4.0	30	3.8	3.9
<b>Michael Sean McLaughlin</b>	33	4.4	14	4.6	4.5
<b>Will Montgomery</b>	24	4.0	19	3.1	3.6
<b>Heather O'Brien</b>	33	4.2	36	4.1	4.1
<b>David L. Roghair</b>	26	3.8	19	3.9	3.8

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



**Table 11**  
**Terrence P. Haas**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	60	87.0
Professional reputation	8	11.6
Other personal contacts	1	1.4
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	52	86.7
Substantial amount of experience	31	51.7
Moderate amount of experience	17	28.3
Limited amount of experience	10	16.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	5	7.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	7.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	2.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	15.9
Government	37	53.6
Public service agency or organization	8	11.6
Retired	-	-
Other	1	1.4
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.4
5 years or fewer	14	20.3
6 to 10 years	15	21.7
11 to 15 years	10	14.5
16 to 20 years	9	13.0
More than 20 years	20	29.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	7	10.1
Criminal	17	24.6
Mixed criminal & civil	27	39.1
Civil	16	23.2
Other	2	2.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	3	4.3
Second District	1	1.4
Third District	35	50.7
Fourth District	29	42.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.4
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	32	46.4
Female	37	53.6

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

**Table 12**  
**Terrence P. Haas**  
**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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	69	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	52	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.3	3.5	3.3	3.5	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	31	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	10	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.1
Professional reputation	8	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.9
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	3	4.0	2.3	2.3	3.3	3.0	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
Government	33	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3
Public service agency or organization	8	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.5
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	13	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.5
6 to 10 years	12	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.8
11 to 15 years	8	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
16 to 20 years	9	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2
More than 20 years	17	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	6	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.3	2.7
Criminal	12	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	26	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Civil	14	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.5
Other	2	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Third District	27	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5
Fourth District	29	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.1
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	26	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3
Female	34	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3

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

**Table 13**  
**Melony P. Lockwood**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	51	89.5
Professional reputation	6	10.5
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	50	98.0
Substantial amount of experience	20	39.2
Moderate amount of experience	20	39.2
Limited amount of experience	11	21.6
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	6	10.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	19.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	7.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	15.8
Government	15	26.3
Public service agency or organization	8	14.0
Retired	1	1.8
Other	3	5.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	3.5
5 years or fewer	10	17.5
6 to 10 years	12	21.1
11 to 15 years	9	15.8
16 to 20 years	8	14.0
More than 20 years	16	28.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	3	5.3
Criminal	4	7.0
Mixed criminal & civil	22	38.6
Civil	28	49.1
Other	-	-
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.8
Second District	-	-
Third District	11	19.3
Fourth District	44	77.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.8
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	29	50.9
Female	28	49.1

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

**Table 14**  
**Melony P. Lockwood**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Professional Competence M</b>	<b>Integrity M</b>	<b>Fairness M</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament M</b>	<b>Suitability of Experience M</b>	<b>Overall Rating M</b>
All respondents	57	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	50	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	-	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	20	3.4	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.6
Limited amount of experience	11	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.2	3.4
Professional reputation	6	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	4	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	3.9	4.2
Government	14	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.1	3.1
Public service agency or organization	7	4.3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	3.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	3.3	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.4
6 to 10 years	10	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.4	3.6	4.1
11 to 15 years	9	3.6	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.1	3.3
16 to 20 years	7	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.3
More than 20 years	16	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	3	2.7	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.3
Criminal	3	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	20	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.2	3.7
Civil	25	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	9	4.0	4.5	4.6	4.3	3.9	4.1
Fourth District	40	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.7
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	26	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.6	4.0
Female	25	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.7

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

**Table 15**  
**Tara Logsdon**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	60	77.9
Professional reputation	11	14.3
Other personal contacts	6	7.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	54	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	23	38.3
Moderate amount of experience	22	36.7
Limited amount of experience	13	21.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	20	26.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	13.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.9
Private, corporate employee	2	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	18	23.4
Government	18	23.4
Public service agency or organization	1	1.3
Retired	5	6.5
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.3
5 years or fewer	5	6.5
6 to 10 years	8	10.4
11 to 15 years	10	13.0
16 to 20 years	14	18.2
More than 20 years	39	50.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.3
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	6	7.8
Mixed criminal & civil	35	45.5
Civil	33	42.9
Other	2	2.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	70	90.9
Fourth District	5	6.5
Outside Alaska	1	1.3
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	37	48.1
Female	40	51.9

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

**Table 16**  
**Tara Logsdon**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<b>n</b>	<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>
All respondents	77	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	54	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	23	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	22	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Limited amount of experience	13	3.9	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	11	2.8	3.1	3.0	3.2	2.8	2.8
Other personal contacts	6	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.8
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	17	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.8	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	-	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Government	13	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.1
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	2.7	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	4	3.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	6	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3
11 to 15 years	8	4.1	4.4	4.8	4.3	3.9	4.1
16 to 20 years	9	3.6	4.4	4.1	4.3	3.7	3.7
More than 20 years	32	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	5	2.4	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.4	2.4
Mixed criminal & civil	30	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.1
Civil	23	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9
Other	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	58	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.9
Fourth District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	30	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.0
Female	30	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.8

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

**Table 17**  
**Michael Sean McLaughlin**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	48	77.4
Professional reputation	11	17.7
Other personal contacts	3	4.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	50.0
Substantial amount of experience	20	41.7
Moderate amount of experience	19	39.6
Limited amount of experience	9	18.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.6
Private, solo	10	16.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	11.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	11.3
Private, corporate employee	2	3.2
Judge or judicial officer	9	14.5
Government	20	32.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	6	9.7
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	5	8.1
5 years or fewer	2	3.2
6 to 10 years	2	3.2
11 to 15 years	2	3.2
16 to 20 years	8	12.9
More than 20 years	43	69.4
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	2	3.2
Prosecution	12	19.4
Criminal	6	9.7
Mixed criminal & civil	15	24.2
Civil	22	35.5
Other	5	8.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.6
First District	2	3.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	51	82.3
Fourth District	6	9.7
Outside Alaska	2	3.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	1.6
Male	43	69.4
Female	18	29.0

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

**Table 18**  
**Michael Sean McLaughlin**  
**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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	62	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	23	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	9	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.3
Professional reputation	11	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	7	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.4	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.7
Government	18	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	5	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
16 to 20 years	8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.6	4.3	4.6
More than 20 years	31	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	11	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7
Criminal	5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	11	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.2
Civil	15	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Other	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.8
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	40	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5
Fourth District	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	33	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4
Female	14	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.6

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



**Table 19**  
**Will Montgomery**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	43	82.7
Professional reputation	7	13.5
Other personal contacts	2	3.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	40	93.0
Substantial amount of experience	25	58.1
Moderate amount of experience	11	25.6
Limited amount of experience	6	14.0
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	5.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	11.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	21.2
Government	26	50.0
Public service agency or organization	2	3.8
Retired	1	1.9
Other	1	1.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.9
5 years or fewer	13	25.0
6 to 10 years	10	19.2
11 to 15 years	7	13.5
16 to 20 years	5	9.6
More than 20 years	16	30.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	11.5
Criminal	5	9.6
Mixed criminal & civil	24	46.2
Civil	16	30.8
Other	1	1.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.9
Second District	1	1.9
Third District	18	34.6
Fourth District	31	59.6
Outside Alaska	1	1.9
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	26	50.0
Female	26	50.0

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

**Table 20**  
**Will Montgomery**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<b>n</b>	<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>
All respondents	52	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	40	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	2	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	25	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8
Moderate amount of experience	11	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4
Limited amount of experience	6	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.3	3.3
Professional reputation	7	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.6	3.7	4.1
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.0	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.0
Government	22	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Retired	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	11	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.7
6 to 10 years	7	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.1
11 to 15 years	6	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.7
16 to 20 years	4	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3
More than 20 years	14	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.3
Criminal	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	23	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.0
Civil	11	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.3
Other	1	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Second District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	11	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6
Fourth District	29	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	24	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0
Female	19	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1

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

**Table 21**  
**Heather O'Brien**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	69	81.2
Professional reputation	9	10.6
Other personal contacts	7	8.2
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	88.4
Substantial amount of experience	20	29.0
Moderate amount of experience	29	42.0
Limited amount of experience	20	29.0
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	11.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	5.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.5
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2
Judge or judicial officer	18	21.2
Government	40	47.1
Public service agency or organization	1	1.2
Retired	5	5.9
Other	2	2.4
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	4.7
5 years or fewer	12	14.1
6 to 10 years	9	10.6
11 to 15 years	9	10.6
16 to 20 years	10	11.8
More than 20 years	41	48.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	11	12.9
Criminal	21	24.7
Mixed criminal & civil	28	32.9
Civil	23	27.1
Other	2	2.4
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.5
Second District	-	-
Third District	70	82.4
Fourth District	11	12.9
Outside Alaska	1	1.2
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	39	45.9
Female	46	54.1

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

**Table 22**  
**Heather O'Brien**  
**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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	85	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Experience within last 5 years	61	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	8	4.1	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.0	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	29	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	20	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.7
Professional reputation	9	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8
Other personal contacts	7	5.0	4.6	4.7	5.0	4.6	4.6
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	9	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.0	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.5
Government	34	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	2	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	10	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.4
6 to 10 years	7	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.1	4.5	4.3
11 to 15 years	5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.4
16 to 20 years	9	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	34	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	10	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.1
Criminal	16	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	25	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.2
Civil	16	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9
Other	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	3	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	57	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
Fourth District	8	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	33	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.2
Female	36	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1

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

**Table 23**  
**David L. Roghair**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	47	82.5
Professional reputation	7	12.3
Other personal contacts	3	5.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	40	85.1
Substantial amount of experience	14	29.8
Moderate amount of experience	12	25.5
Limited amount of experience	21	44.7
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	8	14.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	10.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.3
Private, corporate employee	1	1.8
Judge or judicial officer	13	22.8
Government	23	40.4
Public service agency or organization	2	3.5
Retired	-	-
Other	1	1.8
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.8
5 years or fewer	10	17.5
6 to 10 years	7	12.3
11 to 15 years	7	12.3
16 to 20 years	11	19.3
More than 20 years	21	36.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	2	3.5
Criminal	4	7.0
Mixed criminal & civil	27	47.4
Civil	23	40.4
Other	1	1.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	2	3.5
Second District	3	5.3
Third District	19	33.3
Fourth District	32	56.1
Outside Alaska	1	1.8
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	32	56.1
Female	25	43.9

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

**Table 24**  
**David L. Roghair**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<b>n</b>	<b>Professional Competence M</b>	<b>Integrity M</b>	<b>Fairness M</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament M</b>	<b>Suitability of Experience M</b>	<b>Overall Rating M</b>
All respondents	57	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	40	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.3	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5
Substantial amount of experience	14	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.7
Moderate amount of experience	12	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.8
Limited amount of experience	21	3.4	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9
Professional reputation	7	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.9	3.9
Other personal contacts	3	3.7	4.0	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	8	3.3	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.7
Government	20	3.5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	9	3.3	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.1
6 to 10 years	5	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.2
11 to 15 years	5	3.8	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.0	3.8
16 to 20 years	9	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1
More than 20 years	18	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	2	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5
Criminal	3	3.7	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	25	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4
Civil	17	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5
Second District	3	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0
Third District	12	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
Fourth District	29	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	2.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	27	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
Female	20	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9

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