



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Anchorage Superior Court**

### **Technical Report**

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

*May 18, 2026*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[www.iseralaska.org](http://www.iseralaska.org)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation .....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management .....	6
Results.....	6
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants .....	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings .....	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating .....	9
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice .....	10
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
Table 11: Loren Patrick Hildebrandt: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	15
Table 12: Loren Patrick Hildebrandt: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 13: Matt Widmer: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	17
Table 14: Matt Widmer: Detailed Responses .....	18
Table 15: David Wilkinson: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	19
Table 16: David Wilkinson: Detailed Responses .....	20

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Anchorage Superior Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Dani Crosby. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Loren Patrick Hildebrandt, Matt Widmer, and David Wilkinson.

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

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

**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</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	49	4.1	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	93	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	54	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6

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

# 2026 Judicial Selection Survey, Anchorage Superior Court

## *Introduction*

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

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Alaska Court of Appeals, Kotzebue Superior Court, Anchorage Superior Court, and Anchorage District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for one judicial vacancy on the Anchorage Superior Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Dani Crosby. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Loren Patrick Hildebrandt, Matt Widmer, and David Wilkinson.

## *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. An email invitation to complete the survey online was sent to 3,817 individuals.

Respondents initiated 793 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; eleven surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No duplicate survey responses were submitted. Therefore, 776 online surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis revealed a survey return rate of 20.3%. Of the 776 returned surveys, 375 (48.3%) did not rate any of the twenty applicants (four Alaska Court of Appeals applicants, two Kotzebue Superior Court applicants, three Anchorage Superior Court applicants, and 11 Anchorage District Court applicants); 401 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>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>		<b>776</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>51.7</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>					
	No response	2	0.3	2	0.5
	Private, solo	131	16.9	46	11.5
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	76	9.8	31	7.7
	Private, 6+ attorneys	97	12.5	49	12.2
	Private, corporate employee	21	2.7	4	1.0
	Judge or judicial officer	72	9.3	60	15.0
	Government	218	28.1	155	38.7
	Public service agency or organization	35	4.5	18	4.5
	Retired	115	14.8	32	8.0
	Other	9	1.2	4	1.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>					
	No response	64	8.2	24	6.0
	5 years or fewer	118	15.2	63	15.7
	6 to 10 years	67	8.6	46	11.5
	11 to 15 years	101	13.0	72	18.0
	16 to 20 years	80	10.3	55	13.7
	More than 20 years	346	44.6	141	35.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>					
	No response	4	0.5	2	0.5
	Prosecution	47	6.1	33	8.2
	Criminal	88	11.3	68	17.0
	Mixed criminal & civil	187	24.1	109	27.2
	Civil	401	51.7	175	43.6
	Other	49	6.3	14	3.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>					
	No response	4	0.5	2	0.5
	First District	89	11.5	30	7.5
	Second District	20	2.6	14	3.5
	Third District	556	71.6	297	74.1
	Fourth District	79	10.2	50	12.5
	Outside Alaska	28	3.6	8	2.0
<b>Gender</b>					
	No response	5	0.6	3	0.7
	Male	423	54.5	193	48.1
	Female	342	44.1	204	50.9
	Another identity	6	0.8	1	0.2

## *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.

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

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

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

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

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

## *Confidentiality and Data Safety*

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. 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 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. Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. Each individual's unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys.

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

## ***Data Management***

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. 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 applicant rated is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the applicants. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.

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

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

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

### ***Ratings of Applicants***

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-16 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

**Table 3**  
**Level of Experience with the 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>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	62	8.0	82.3	8.1	9.7
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	126	16.2	75.4	17.5	7.1
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	67	8.6	82.1	11.9	6.0

**Table 4**  
**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>
<b>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	59	4.0	4.0	1.2	49	4.1	5.0	1.2
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	123	4.3	5.0	1.0	93	4.5	5.0	0.8
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	65	4.6	5.0	0.8	54	4.6	5.0	0.9

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

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	49	2	4.1	4	8.2	6	12.2	12	24.5	25	51.0
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	93	1	1.1	2	2.2	6	6.5	27	29.0	57	61.3
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	54	1	1.9	2	3.7	2	3.7	6	11.1	43	79.6

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

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

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	4	4.8	2	4.5	1	1.0	1	5.0	16	4.4	18	3.7	2	4.0	5	4.4	-	-	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	13	4.8	7	4.4	19	4.7	-	-	17	4.5	30	4.1	3	4.3	4	5.0	-	-	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	1	5.0	1	4.0	11	4.5	-	-	6	4.5	28	4.7	1	4.0	5	5.0	-	-	4.6

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>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	4	3.8	6	3.5	9	4.4	5	4.4	22	4.2	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	4	4.3	3	4.0	14	4.9	11	4.9	20	4.7	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	1	5.0	10	4.5	20	4.7	21	4.5	39	4.4	4.6

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>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	-	-	7	3.9	19	4.2	20	4.2	3	3.7	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	5	4.0	19	4.5	35	4.5	33	4.6	3	4.0	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	-	-	-	-	13	4.4	41	4.7	-	-	4.6

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>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	1	5.0	1	4.0	45	4.1	1	4.0	1	4.0	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	1	5.0	4	4.5	80	4.5	6	4.5	2	5.0	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	5	5.0	-	-	46	4.6	2	5.0	-	-	4.6

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

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

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Loren Patrick Hildebrandt</b>	17	4.4	32	4.0	-	-	4.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	52	4.7	41	4.2	-	-	4.5
<b>David Wilkinson</b>	27	4.7	25	4.6	-	-	4.6

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

**Table 11**  
**Loren Patrick Hildebrandt**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	51	82.3
Professional reputation	5	8.1
Other personal contacts	6	9.7
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	47	92.2
Substantial amount of experience	27	52.9
Moderate amount of experience	14	27.5
Limited amount of experience	10	19.6
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	4	6.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	8.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	8.1
Private, corporate employee	1	1.6
Judge or judicial officer	16	25.8
Government	21	33.9
Public service agency or organization	3	4.8
Retired	7	11.3
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	6.5
5 years or fewer	5	8.1
6 to 10 years	8	12.9
11 to 15 years	11	17.7
16 to 20 years	6	9.7
More than 20 years	28	45.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	1.6
Criminal	9	14.5
Mixed criminal & civil	22	35.5
Civil	26	41.9
Other	4	6.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.6
Second District	1	1.6
Third District	57	91.9
Fourth District	2	3.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.6
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	24	38.7
Female	38	61.3
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 12**  
**Loren Patrick Hildebrandt**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	62	4.0	4.7	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Experience within last 5 years	47	4.1	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.0	4.7	4.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	27	4.0	4.8	4.7	4.3	3.9	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.3
Limited amount of experience	10	4.0	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	2.6	3.0
Other personal contacts	6	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.2	4.0	4.2
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	1.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	16	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.4
Government	18	3.7	4.7	4.4	4.1	3.4	3.7
Public service agency or organization	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.0
Retired	5	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	3.8	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.8
6 to 10 years	6	3.5	4.7	4.2	3.5	3.5	3.5
11 to 15 years	9	4.3	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	5	4.4	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.4
More than 20 years	23	4.2	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.0	4.2
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	7	4.0	4.6	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	19	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2
Civil	22	4.2	4.8	4.7	4.3	3.9	4.2
Other	3	3.3	4.7	4.3	4.7	3.7	3.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	47	4.1	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.1
Fourth District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	18	4.3	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Female	33	4.0	4.7	4.5	4.2	3.8	4.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 13**  
**Matt Widmer**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	95	75.4
Professional reputation	22	17.5
Other personal contacts	9	7.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	77	81.1
Substantial amount of experience	30	31.6
Moderate amount of experience	45	47.4
Limited amount of experience	20	21.1
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	18	14.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	8.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	16.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	19	15.1
Government	46	36.5
Public service agency or organization	5	4.0
Retired	6	4.8
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	3.2
5 years or fewer	6	4.8
6 to 10 years	17	13.5
11 to 15 years	23	18.3
16 to 20 years	25	19.8
More than 20 years	51	40.5
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	6.3
Criminal	32	25.4
Mixed criminal & civil	39	31.0
Civil	43	34.1
Other	4	3.2
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	4	3.2
Second District	4	3.2
Third District	108	85.7
Fourth District	7	5.6
Outside Alaska	3	2.4
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	69	54.8
Female	57	45.2
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 14**  
**Matt Widmer**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	126	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	77	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	30	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	45	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	20	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6
Professional reputation	22	4.0	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.1
Other personal contacts	9	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	13	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Government	31	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.3	4.3
Retired	5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
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	10	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	20	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
16 to 20 years	22	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5
More than 20 years	40	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	5	4.2	4.6	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.0
Criminal	19	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	35	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Civil	33	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
Other	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.0	4.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	4	4.3	4.8	4.8	3.8	4.5	4.5
Third District	81	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Fourth District	6	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	53	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Female	42	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 15**  
**David Wilkinson**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	55	82.1
Professional reputation	8	11.9
Other personal contacts	4	6.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	48	87.3
Substantial amount of experience	23	41.8
Moderate amount of experience	18	32.7
Limited amount of experience	14	25.5
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.5
Private, solo	2	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	19.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	10.4
Government	34	50.7
Public service agency or organization	2	3.0
Retired	5	7.5
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	3.0
5 years or fewer	6	9.0
6 to 10 years	5	7.5
11 to 15 years	18	26.9
16 to 20 years	14	20.9
More than 20 years	22	32.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	1.5
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	1	1.5
Mixed criminal & civil	17	25.4
Civil	46	68.7
Other	2	3.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.5
First District	5	7.5
Second District	2	3.0
Third District	55	82.1
Fourth District	4	6.0
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	2	3.0
Male	31	46.3
Female	34	50.7
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 16**  
**David Wilkinson**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	67	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Experience within last 5 years	48	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.6	4.9
Substantial amount of experience	23	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	18	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	14	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.5
Professional reputation	8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.0	4.5
Government	28	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0
Retired	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.3
6 to 10 years	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	14	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.9
16 to 20 years	12	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9
More than 20 years	20	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.7
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mixed criminal & civil	13	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.4
Civil	41	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	47	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.6
Fourth District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	28	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Female	25	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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