



alaska judicial council

510 L Street, Suite 450, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1295 (907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us> E-Mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

Juror Survey Report: Judges Eligible to Stand for Retention in 2026

The Alaska judicial Council collected surveys from jurors who sat in trials during 2024, 2025, and the first part of 2026. The jurors sat before 20 of the 21 trial court judges eligible to stand for retention in 2026. A total of 869 jurors responded on Council-provided postcards that judges distributed to jurors at the end of each trial (see attached Juror Survey Card Example). Jurors completed the surveys on the postage-paid cards and mailed them to the Council.

Council staff entered the data from the surveys and ran basic descriptive statistics. This memorandum summarizes the findings. It is distributed to Council members and judges and posted on the Council's website.

Table 1 shows the distribution of jurors by type of trial reported for each judge. Some jurors only wrote comments and did not rate the judge on the specific variables, thus, there may be more respondents shown in Table 1 than appear in the judges' individual tables.

Table 1: Distribution of Jurors by Type of Trial, by Judge

JudgeName	Civil	Criminal	No answer	Total
Carpeneti, Marianna	12	5	0	17
Darnall, Chris	2	19	2	21
Doty, Daniel	0	18	6	18
Fallon, Martin	0	9	1	9
Hartz, Laura	19	1	0	20
Lamoureaux, Yvonne	19	3	1	22
Lawson, Kelly	9	34	3	43
Lybrand, Katherine	5	19	3	24
McKenna, Jack	5	100	2	105
Nesbett, David	24	44	3	68
Peters, Nathaniel	1	35	4	36
Rankin, Christina	0	35	1	35
Reigh, Christina	0	62	13	62
Roghair, David	0	4	0	4
Schwalm, Kirk	1	87	1	88
Seekins, Benjamin	6	54	2	60
Traini, Shawn	9	14	0	23
Welch, Amy	1	11	0	12
Wheeles, Ian	0	25	1	25
Woodman, Jonathan	16	112	4	128

¹ Note: juror responses were not received for Judge Kirsten Swanson

* Source: Alaska Judicial Council, 2026 Retention Juror Survey

Table 2 shows the distribution of number of days served, as reported by the jurors. Fifty-eight percent of the jurors served fewer than five days.

Table 2: Distribution of Days Served by Jurors

Number of Days Served	Percentage	Count
1-2 days	21.5	187
3-4 days	36.5	317
5-7 days	24.5	213
8-10 days	7.7	67
11-20 days	4.4	38
21 or more days	1.7	15
No answer	3.7	32

* Source: Alaska Judicial Council, 2026 Retention Juror Survey

Individual Results

Table 3 shows each judge's mean rating for each question on the survey. Each judge's individual survey results are provided in separate tables. Jurors used a five-point scale, with excellent corresponding to five and poor corresponding to one. The closer the jurors' ratings were to five, the higher that judge's evaluation by the jurors. The last column shows the total number of jurors who evaluated the judge on at least one variable.

Table 3: Mean Rating for each Variable and for Overall Performance, by Judge

Judge Name	Impartiality and Fairness	Respectful and Courteous	Attentive During Proceedings	Control During Proceedings	Intelligence and Skill as a Judge	Overall	Count
Carpeneti, Marianna	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	17
Darnall, Chris	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	23
Doty, Daniel	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	24
Fallon, Martin	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	10
Hartz, Laura	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	20
Lamoureaux, Yvonne	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	22
Lawson, Kelly	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	46
Lybrand, Katherine	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	27
McKenna, Jack	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	107
Nesbett, David	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	71
Peters, Nathaniel	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	39
Rankin, Christina	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	35
Reigh, Christina	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	75
Roghair, David	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.3	4
Schwalm, Kirk	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	88
Seekins, Benjamin	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	62
Traini, Shawn	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	23
Welch, Amy	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	12
Wheeles, Ian	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.9	26
Woodman, Jonathan	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	132

¹ Note: juror responses were not received for Judge Kirsten Swanson

* Source: Alaska Judicial Council, 2026 Retention Juror Survey

Table 4: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Carpeneti, Marianna

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	3	14	17
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	16	17
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	2	15	17
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	0	17	17

Table 5: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Darnall, Chris

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5	0	0	0	1	22	23
Respectful / Courteous	5	0	0	0	0	23	23
Attentive During Proceedings	5	0	0	0	0	23	23
Control Over Proceedings	5	0	0	0	0	23	23
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5	0	0	0	0	23	23
Overall Evaluation	5	0	0	0	0	23	23

Table 6: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Doty, Daniel

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	6	18	24
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	0	6	18	24
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	7	17	24
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	5	19	24
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.7	0	0	0	7	17	24
Overall Evaluation	4.7	0	0	0	8	16	24

Table 7: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Fallon, Martin

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	1	9	10
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Attentive During Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	1	9	10
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	1	9	10
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	1	9	10

Table 8: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Hartz, Laura

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5	0	0	0	0	20	20
Respectful / Courteous	5	0	0	0	0	20	20
Attentive During Proceedings	5	0	0	0	0	20	20
Control Over Proceedings	5	0	0	0	1	19	20
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5	0	0	0	0	20	20
Overall Evaluation	5	0	0	0	0	20	20

Table 9: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Lamoureux, Yvonne

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5.0	0	0	0	1	21	22
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	20	22
Control Over Proceedings	5.0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	1	21	22
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	1	21	22

Table 10: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Lawson, Kelly

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	2	4	40	46
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	2	3	41	46
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	2	3	41	46
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	0	2	4	40	46
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	2	3	41	46
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	2	4	40	46

Table 11: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Lybrand, Katherine

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	2	25	27

Table 12: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: McKenna, Jack

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	0	6	101	107
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	3	104	107
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	8	99	107
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	7	100	107
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	7	100	107
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	0	4	103	107

Table 13: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Nesbett, David

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	1	5	65	71
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	5	66	71
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	5	65	71
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	6	65	71
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	4	67	71
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	5	66	71

Table 14: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Peters, Nathaniel

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.3	0	0	6	14	19	39
Respectful / Courteous	4.4	0	0	7	10	23	40
Attentive During Proceedings	4.4	0	1	5	12	22	40
Control Over Proceedings	4.4	0	0	6	11	23	40
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.4	0	1	6	10	23	40
Overall Evaluation	4.4	1	0	5	11	23	40

Table 15: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Rankin, Christina

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	4	30	35
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	1	2	33	36
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	3	1	32	36
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	0	2	3	31	36
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	1	5	30	36
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	1	4	31	36

Table 16: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Reigh, Christina

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	13	62	75
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	6	69	75
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	9	66	75
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	11	64	75
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	11	64	75
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	8	67	75

Table 17: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Roghair, David

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Respectful / Courteous	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	0	1	3	4
Control Over Proceedings	4.5	0	0	0	2	2	4
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.5	0	0	0	2	2	4
Overall Evaluation	4.3	0	0	0	2	1	3

Table 18: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Schwalm, Kirk

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	1	14	73	88
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	10	79	89
Attentive During Proceedings	4.8	0	0	2	13	74	89
Control Over Proceedings	4.8	0	2	1	12	75	89
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	0	13	74	87
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	0	14	75	89

Table 19: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Seekins, Benjamin

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	10	52	62
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	6	55	61
Attentive During Proceedings	4.7	0	0	2	12	47	61
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	9	53	62
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	0	11	51	62
Overall Evaluation	4.8	0	0	1	11	50	2

Table 20: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Traini, Shawn

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	1	0	22	23

Table 21: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Welch, Amy

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	5	0	0	0	0	12	12
Respectful / Courteous	5	0	0	0	0	12	12
Attentive During Proceedings	5	0	0	0	0	12	12
Control Over Proceedings	5	0	0	0	0	12	12
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5	0	0	0	0	12	12
Overall Evaluation	5	0	0	0	0	12	12

Table 22: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Wheelles, Ian

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.8	0	0	0	5	21	26
Respectful / Courteous	4.9	0	0	0	3	23	26
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	3	23	26
Control Over Proceedings	4.7	0	1	1	4	20	26
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	4.8	0	0	1	3	22	26
Overall Evaluation	4.9	0	0	0	3	23	26

Table 23: Juror Survey Results 2026 Retention Evaluation: Woodman, Jonathan

Survey Category	Mean	Poor (1)	Deficient (2)	Acceptable (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total Responses
Impartiality / Fairness	4.9	0	0	1	6	125	132
Respectful / Courteous	5.0	0	0	0	3	129	132
Attentive During Proceedings	4.9	0	0	0	7	125	132
Control Over Proceedings	4.9	0	0	2	8	122	132
Intelligence / Skill as a Judge	5.0	0	0	0	5	127	132
Overall Evaluation	5.0	0	0	1	4	127	132

Juror Survey - Superior Court Judge

In Alaska, judges must appear periodically on the ballot to allow voters the opportunity to decide whether they should be retained in office. The Alaska Judicial Council is a citizens' commission that must evaluate judges standing for retention and make recommendations to Alaska voters. The Council collects information from many sources, including jurors. The Council's evaluations, including the results of its juror surveys appear in the election pamphlet sent to every Alaskan household.

Type of Proceedings: () Civil
() Criminal

Approximately how many days, including deliberations, did you serve as a juror for this judge? day(s)

Please complete this questionnaire to help the Council evaluate the judge who presided over your case. The Council and the public value your perspective. Thanks.

Please check the most appropriate response to each question.	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor
1. Was the judge fair and impartial to all sides in the case?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Was the judge respectful and courteous?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the judge attentive during the proceedings?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Did the judge exercise appropriate control over the proceedings?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. How would you evaluate the judge's intelligence and skill as a judge?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. How would you evaluate the judge overall?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do you have any suggestions about how the judge could improve upon his or her performance? _____

Alaska Judicial Council + 510 L Street, Suite 450, Anchorage, AK 99501 + Phone: 279-2526 + E-mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us