



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Technical Report

Ashley Schroeder, MPH, Research Professional
Ashley Hannigan, MPH, MA, Research Professional

November, 2026

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Instrumentation	4
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	4
Results.....	4
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 2: Level of Experience with Judges.....	6
Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings	7
Table 4: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	8
Table 4 (cont.): Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating.....	9
Table 5: Justice Jude Pate: Description of Respondents.....	10
Table 6: Justice Jude Pate: Detailed Responses.....	10
Table 7: Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti: Description of Respondents' Experience	11
Table 8: Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti: Detailed Responses.....	11
Table 9: Judge Daniel E. Doty: Description of Respondents' Experience	12
Table 10: Judge Daniel E. Doty: Detailed Responses	12
Table 11: Judge Katherine H. Lybrand: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	13
Table 12: Judge Katherine H. Lybrand: Detailed Responses	13
Table 13: Kirsten L. Swanson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	14
Table 14: Judge Kirsten L. Swanson: Detailed Responses.....	14
Table 15: Judge David L. Roghair: Description of Respondents' Experience	15
Table 16: Judge David L. Roghair: Detailed Responses	15
Table 17: Judge Laura Hartz: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 18: Judge Laura Hartz: Detailed Responses	16
Table 19: Judge Yvonne Lamoureux: Description of Respondents' Experience	17
Table 20: Judge Yvonne Lamoureux: Detailed Responses	17
Table 21: Judge Kelly J. Lawson: Description of Respondents' Experience	18
Table 22: Judge Kelly J. Lawson: Detailed Responses	18
Table 23: Judge Jack R. McKenna: Description of Respondents' Experience	19
Table 24: Judge Jack R. McKenna: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 25: Judge David A. Nesbett: Description of Respondents' Experience	20
Table 26: Judge David A. Nesbett: Detailed Responses	20
Table 27: Judge Christina Rankin: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	21
Table 28: Judge Christina Rankin: Detailed Responses	21
Table 29: Judge Christina Reigh: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	22
Table 30: Judge Christina Reigh: Detailed Responses	22
Table 31: Judge Ian Wheelles: Description of Respondents' Experience	23
Table 32: Judge Ian Wheelles: Detailed Responses	23
Table 33: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Description of Respondents' Experience	24
Table 34: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Detailed Responses.....	24
Table 35: Judge Chris Darnall: Description of Respondents' Experience	25
Table 36: Judge Chris Darnall: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 37: Judge Martin Fallon: Description of Respondents' Experience	26
Table 38: Judge Martin Fallon: Detailed Responses	26
Table 39: Judge Shawn D. Traini: Description of Respondents' Experience	27
Table 40: Judge Shawn D. Traini: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 41: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	28

Table 42: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Detailed Responses	28
Table 43: Judge Kirk Schwalm: Description of Respondents' Experience	29
Table 44: Judge Kirk Schwalm: Detailed Responses	29
Table 45: Judge Amy Welch: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	30
Table 46: Judge Amy Welch: Detailed Responses	30
Table 47: Judge Benjamin A. Seekins: Description of Respondents' Experience	31
Table 48: Judge Benjamin A. Seekins: Detailed Responses	31

Executive Summary

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska court employees to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2026 survey included 23 judges eligible for retention. After the survey closed, Judge DiBenedetto resigned from his position; therefore, his results are not included here.

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

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

Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges
Mean Ratings of Judges

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall Evaluation
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Justice Jude Pate	30	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti	28	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.6
Judge Daniel E. Doty	19	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand	15	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson	23	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Judge David L. Roghair	13	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
Judge Laura Hartz	31	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	37	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Judge Kelly J. Lawson	27	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.3
Judge Jack R. McKenna	27	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Judge David A. Nesbett	43	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Judge Christina Rankin	24	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Judge Christina Reigh	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Judge Ian Wheelles	35	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	29	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Judge Chris Darnall	34	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.8
Judge Martin Fallon	22	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.2
Judge Shawn D. Traini	29	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Judge Nathaniel Peters	18	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7
Judge Kirk Schwalm	29	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Judge Amy Welch	25	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins	27	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9

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

2026 Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Introduction

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

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

This 2026 retention survey for court employees included 23 judges eligible for retention. After the survey closed, Judge DiBenedetto resigned from his position; therefore, his results are not included here.

Methodology

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

Of the 610 total employees invited via email to participate, 254 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 41.6%. Of the 254 returned surveys, 29 did not rate any of the judges; 225 (88.6%) respondents evaluated one or more judges.

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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 retention survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. All data are maintained on a secure server.

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

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents' level of experience with each judge is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the judges. 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.

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Judge

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

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

Ratings of Judges

Table 3 presents results on the *Overall* item by comparing all respondents to those with direct professional experience; the table presents the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*) as well as the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*). Table 4 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item among respondents who indicated direct professional experience.

For each individual judge, Tables 5-48 provide a summary of respondents’ experience with each judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience.

Summary Tables

Table 2: Level of Experience with Judges
Respondents' Level of Experience with Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Justice Jude Pate	43	16.9	69.8	14.0	16.3
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti	30	11.8	93.3	3.3	3.3
Judge Daniel E. Doty	23	9.1	82.6	8.7	8.7
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand	18	7.1	83.3	11.1	5.6
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson	27	10.6	85.2	14.8	-
Judge David L. Roghair	20	7.9	65.0	10.0	25.0
Judge Laura Hartz	41	16.1	75.6	22.0	2.4
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	41	16.1	90.2	7.3	2.4
Judge Kelly J. Lawson	30	11.8	90.0	6.7	3.3
Judge Jack R. McKenna	33	13.0	81.8	15.2	3.0
Judge David A. Nesbett	50	19.7	86.0	12.0	2.0
Judge Christina Rankin	34	13.4	70.6	26.5	2.9
Judge Christina Reigh	17	6.7	76.5	17.6	5.9
Judge Ian Wheelles	41	16.1	85.4	14.6	-
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	34	13.4	85.3	5.9	8.8
Judge Chris Darnall	37	14.6	91.9	8.1	-
Judge Martin Fallon	26	10.2	84.6	3.8	11.5
Judge Shawn D. Traini	31	12.2	93.5	3.2	3.2
Judge Nathaniel Peters	20	7.9	90.0	5.0	5.0
Judge Kirk Schwalm	32	12.6	90.6	6.3	3.1
Judge Amy Welch	27	10.6	92.6	3.7	3.7
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins	29	11.4	93.1	3.4	3.4

Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Justice Jude Pate	39	4.8	5.0	0.6	30	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti	28	4.6	5.0	0.8	28	4.6	5.0	0.8
Judge Daniel E. Doty	18	4.2	5.0	1.2	19	4.2	5.0	1.2
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand	16	4.9	5.0	0.3	15	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson	27	4.1	5.0	1.4	23	4.2	5.0	1.2
Judge David L. Roghair	19	4.5	5.0	0.8	13	4.7	5.0	0.7
Judge Laura Hartz	38	4.7	5.0	0.6	31	4.7	5.0	0.6
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	40	4.8	5.0	0.4	37	4.8	5.0	0.6
Judge Kelly J. Lawson	30	3.4	4.0	1.2	27	3.3	4.0	1.2
Judge Jack R. McKenna	33	4.8	5.0	0.6	27	4.9	5.0	0.3
Judge David A. Nesbett	48	4.7	5.0	0.6	43	4.8	5.0	0.6
Judge Christina Rankin	33	4.6	5.0	0.7	24	4.8	5.0	0.5
Judge Christina Reigh	17	4.7	5.0	0.6	13	4.8	5.0	0.4
Judge Ian Wheelles	41	4.6	5.0	0.6	35	4.6	5.0	0.5
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	34	4.6	5.0	0.8	29	4.6	5.0	0.8
Judge Chris Darnall	37	4.7	5.0	0.6	34	4.8	5.0	0.6
Judge Martin Fallon	26	4.2	4.0	1.0	22	4.2	4.0	0.8
Judge Shawn D. Traini	29	4.7	5.0	0.5	29	4.7	5.0	0.4
Judge Nathaniel Peters	19	4.6	5.0	0.7	18	4.7	5.0	0.6
Judge Kirk Schwalm	32	4.8	5.0	0.4	29	4.9	5.0	0.4
Judge Amy Welch	27	4.4	5.0	0.7	25	4.4	5.0	0.8
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins	29	4.9	5.0	0.4	27	4.9	5.0	0.5

Table 4: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

		Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Justice Jude Pate	30	-	-	-	-	1	3.6	2	7.1	25	89.3
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti	28	-	-	2	7.4	-	-	6	22.2	19	70.4
Judge Daniel E. Doty	19	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	4	25.0	9	56.3
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	14.3	12	85.7
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson	23	1	4.3	2	8.7	2	8.7	4	17.4	14	60.9
Judge David L. Roghair	13	-	-	-	-	1	8.3	2	16.7	9	75.0
Judge Laura Hartz	31	-	-	-	-	2	6.9	4	13.8	23	79.3
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux	37	-	-	-	-	2	5.6	5	13.9	29	80.6
Judge Kelly J. Lawson	27	2	7.4	7	25.9	3	11.1	11	40.7	4	14.8
Judge Jack R. McKenna	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7.4	25	92.6
Judge David A. Nesbett	43	-	-	1	2.4	-	-	5	12.2	35	85.4
Judge Christina Rankin	24	-	-	-	-	1	4.3	3	13.0	19	82.6
Judge Christina Reigh	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	10	76.9
Judge Ian Wheelles	35	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	11	31.4	23	65.7
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	29	-	-	1	3.4	2	6.9	6	20.7	20	69.0
Judge Chris Darnall	34	-	-	-	-	2	5.9	4	11.8	28	82.4
Judge Martin Fallon	22	-	-	1	4.5	2	9.1	11	50.0	8	36.4
Judge Shawn D. Traini	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	25.9	20	74.1
Judge Nathaniel Peters	18	-	-	-	-	1	5.9	3	17.6	13	76.5

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

Table 4 (cont.): Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Judge Kirk Schwalm	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	13.8	25	86.2
Judge Amy Welch	25	-	-	-	-	4	16.0	7	28.0	14	56.0
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins	27	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	2	7.4	24	88.9

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

Individual Tables

Table 5

Justice Jude Pate

Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	43	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	69.8
Professional reputation	6	14.0
Other personal contacts	7	16.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	100
Substantial amount of experience	10	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	10	33.3
Limited amount of experience	10	33.3

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

Table 6

Justice Jude Pate

Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	43	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	6	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	7	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8

Table 7
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	28	93.3
Professional reputation	1	3.3
Other personal contacts	1	3.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	100
Substantial amount of experience	12	42.9
Moderate amount of experience	8	28.6
Limited amount of experience	8	28.6

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

Table 8
Judge Marianna C. Carpeneti
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	30	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	28	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.3	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.6
Limited amount of experience	8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.6
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 9
Judge Daniel E. Doty
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	23	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	19	82.6
Professional reputation	2	8.7
Other personal contacts	2	8.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	19	100
Substantial amount of experience	12	63.2
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	7	36.8

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

Table 10
Judge Daniel E. Doty
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	19	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	19	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.8
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 11
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	18	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	15	83.3
Professional reputation	2	11.1
Other personal contacts	1	5.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	14	93.3
Substantial amount of experience	6	40.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	33.3
Limited amount of experience	4	26.7

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

Table 12
Judge Katherine H. Lybrand
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	18	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	15	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	14	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 13
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	27	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	23	85.2
Professional reputation	4	14.8
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100
Substantial amount of experience	11	47.8
Moderate amount of experience	11	47.8
Limited amount of experience	1	4.3

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

Table 14
Judge Kirsten L. Swanson
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.1
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	23	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	4.0		5.0
Professional reputation	4	4.0	3.3	3.0	4.0	3.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15
Judge David L. Roghair
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	20	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	13	65.0
Professional reputation	2	10.0
Other personal contacts	5	25.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	13	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	46.2
Moderate amount of experience	3	23.1
Limited amount of experience	4	30.8

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

Table 16
Judge David L. Roghair
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	13	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	13	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	43	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.7	5.0
Limited amount of experience	4	4.0	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	5	4.3	4.8	4.8	4.0	4.4

Table 17
Judge Laura Hartz
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	31	75.6
Professional reputation	9	22.0
Other personal contacts	1	2.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	96.8
Substantial amount of experience	6	20.0
Moderate amount of experience	13	43.3
Limited amount of experience	11	36.7

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

Table 18
Judge Laura Hartz
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	41	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	31	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	13	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	11	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8
Professional reputation	9	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

Table 19
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	37	90.2
Professional reputation	3	7.3
Other personal contacts	1	2.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	36	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	16.2
Moderate amount of experience	23	62.2
Limited amount of experience	8	21.6

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

Table 20
Judge Yvonne Lamoureux
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	41	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	37	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	36	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.7	4.7	4.3	5.0	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	23	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 21
Judge Kelly J. Lawson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	27	90.0
Professional reputation	2	6.7
Other personal contacts	1	3.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100
Substantial amount of experience	9	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	10	37.0
Limited amount of experience	8	29.6

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

Table 22
Judge Kelly J. Lawson
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	30	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.6	3.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	27	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	27	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	3.1	3.0	2.1	2.3	2.4
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.4	4.0	3.3	4.1	3.3
Limited amount of experience	8	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 23
Judge Jack R. McKenna
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	33	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	27	81.8
Professional reputation	5	15.2
Other personal contacts	1	3.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	96.2
Substantial amount of experience	6	22.2
Moderate amount of experience	12	44.4
Limited amount of experience	9	33.3

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

Table 24
Judge Jack R. McKenna
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	27	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	9	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.7	4.8
Professional reputation	5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

Table 25
Judge David A. Nesbett
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	50	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	43	86.0
Professional reputation	6	12.0
Other personal contacts	1	2.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	41	100
Substantial amount of experience	10	23.3
Moderate amount of experience	21	48.8
Limited amount of experience	12	27.9

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

Table 26
Judge David A. Nesbett
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	50	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	43	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	41	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.7	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	21	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	12	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	6	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.3
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

Table 27
Judge Christina Rankin
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	34	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	24	70.6
Professional reputation	9	26.5
Other personal contacts	1	2.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	100
Substantial amount of experience	7	29.2
Moderate amount of experience	12	50.0
Limited amount of experience	5	20.8

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

Table 28
Judge Christina Rankin
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	34	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	24	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	9	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 29
Judge Christina Reigh
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	17	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	13	76.5
Professional reputation	3	17.6
Other personal contacts	1	5.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	12	92.3
Substantial amount of experience	3	23.1
Moderate amount of experience	4	30.8
Limited amount of experience	6	46.2

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

Table 30
Judge Christina Reigh
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	17	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	12	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

Table 31
Judge Ian Wheelles
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	35	85.4
Professional reputation	6	14.6
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	97.1
Substantial amount of experience	5	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	17	48.6
Limited amount of experience	13	37.1

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

Table 32
Judge Ian Wheelles
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	41	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	35	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	13	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5
Professional reputation	6	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 33
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	34	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	85.3
Professional reputation	2	5.9
Other personal contacts	3	8.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100
Substantial amount of experience	15	51.7
Moderate amount of experience	10	34.5
Limited amount of experience	4	13.8

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

Table 34
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	34	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	15	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.6
Limited amount of experience	4	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0
Other personal contacts	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 35
Judge Chris Darnall
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	37	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	34	91.9
Professional reputation	3	8.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	100
Substantial amount of experience	14	41.2
Moderate amount of experience	13	38.2
Limited amount of experience	7	20.6

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

Table 36
Judge Chris Darnall
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	37	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	34	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	14	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.7	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	13	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.8
Limited amount of experience	7	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.4
Professional reputation	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 37
Judge Martin Fallon
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	26	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	22	84.6
Professional reputation	1	3.8
Other personal contacts	3	11.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	100
Substantial amount of experience	8	36.4
Moderate amount of experience	10	45.5
Limited amount of experience	4	18.2

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

Table 38
Judge Martin Fallon
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	26	4.3	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	22	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	22	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.3	4.4	4.0	3.4	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
Limited amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.3
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	3	3.7	4.0	4.3	3.3	3.7

Table 39
Judge Shawn D. Traini
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	31	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	93.5
Professional reputation	1	3.2
Other personal contacts	1	3.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100
Substantial amount of experience	16	55.2
Moderate amount of experience	10	34.5
Limited amount of experience	3	10.3

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

Table 40
Judge Shawn D. Traini
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	31	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	16	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 41
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	20	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	90.0
Professional reputation	1	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	50.0
Limited amount of experience	3	16.7

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

Table 42
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	20	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.6
Limited amount of experience	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0

Table 43
Judge Kirk Schwalm
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	32	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	90.6
Professional reputation	2	6.3
Other personal contacts	1	3.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100
Substantial amount of experience	6	20.7
Moderate amount of experience	11	37.9
Limited amount of experience	12	41.4

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

Table 44
Judge Kirk Schwalm
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	32	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	11	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	12	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.8
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	5.0	-	5.0

Table 45
Judge Amy Welch
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	27	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	25	92.6
Professional reputation	1	3.7
Other personal contacts	1	3.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	100
Substantial amount of experience	7	28.0
Moderate amount of experience	12	48.0
Limited amount of experience	6	24.0

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

Table 46
Judge Amy Welch
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	25	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	6	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	5.0	-	5.0

Table 47
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	27	93.1
Professional reputation	1	3.4
Other personal contacts	1	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100
Substantial amount of experience	5	18.5
Moderate amount of experience	14	51.9
Limited amount of experience	8	29.6

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

Table 48
Judge Benjamin A. Seekins
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	29	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	27	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	5.0	-	5.0