



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Anchorage Superior Court**

### **Technical Report**

Nathan Rabang, BS, Research Professional  
Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional  
Rosyland Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional

*November 15-19, 2021*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology .....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation .....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management .....	6
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants .....	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings .....	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating .....	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice .....	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice .....	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled .....	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice .....	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender .....	15
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 11: Kate Demarest: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	16
Table 12: Kate Demarest: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Laura Hartz: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Laura Hartz: Detailed Responses .....	19
Table 15: Jack R. McKenna: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Jack R. McKenna: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 17: Margaret Paton Walsh: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Margaret Paton Walsh: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Christina Rankin: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Christina Rankin: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 21: Ian Wheelles: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	26
Table 22: Ian Wheelles: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 23: Matt Widmer: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	28
Table 24: Matt Widmer: Detailed Responses .....	29

## *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 appointment of Judge Jennifer Stuart Henderson to the Alaska Supreme Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kate Demarest, Laura Hartz, Jack R. McKenna, Margaret Paton Walsh, Christina Rankin, Ian Wheelles, and Matt Widmer.

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**

	<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>
<b>Kate Demarest</b>	97	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	86	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	111	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	147	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	80	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	78	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	99	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0

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

# 2021 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. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Council but returned directly to ISER for processing, data entry, and analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Juneau Superior Court, Utqiagvik Superior Court, and Anchorage Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Anchorage Superior Court, created by the appointment of Judge Jennifer Stuart Henderson to the Alaska Supreme Court. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kate Demarest, Laura Hartz, Jack R. McKenna, Margaret Paton Walsh, Christina Rankin, Ian Wheelles, and Matt Widmer.

## *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 3,568 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,549) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Five individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 14 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 885 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. Ten 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 online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 869 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned seven paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper surveys were excluded because they were unsigned. No paper surveys were excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. One paper survey was excluded because the respondent failed to answer the question that described the basis of their evaluation, which is required. Therefore, six paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 869 online surveys and six paper surveys, for a total of 875 surveys and a survey return rate of 24.5%. Of the 875 returned surveys, 277 (31.7%) did not rate any of the 17 applicants (seven Juneau Superior Court applicants, three Utqiagvik Superior Court applicants, and seven Anchorage Superior Court applicants); 598 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

**Table 2**  
**Respondent Characteristics**

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		n	%	n	%
	<b>875</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>Type of Practice</b>					
	No response	7	0.8	6	1.0
	Private, solo	188	21.5	106	17.7
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	100	11.4	61	10.2
	Private, 6+ attorneys	110	12.6	76	12.7
	Private, corporate employee	22	2.5	16	2.7
	Judge or judicial officer	84	9.6	71	11.9
	Government	208	23.8	181	30.3
	Public service agency or organization	32	3.7	24	4.0
	Retired	111	12.7	50	8.4
	Other	13	1.5	7	1.2
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>					
	No response	46	5.3	27	4.5
	5 years or fewer	86	9.8	62	10.4
	6 to 10 years	94	10.7	78	13.0
	11 to 15 years	102	11.7	81	13.5
	16 to 20 years	88	10.1	71	11.9
	More than 20 years	459	52.5	279	46.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>					
	No response	7	0.8	5	0.8
	Prosecution	49	5.6	42	7.0
	Criminal	62	7.1	42	7.0
	Mixed criminal & civil	210	24.0	157	26.3
	Civil	485	55.4	319	53.3
	Other	62	7.1	33	5.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>					
	No response	9	1.0	4	0.7
	First District	137	15.7	111	18.6
	Second District	17	1.9	16	2.7
	Third District	599	68.5	415	69.4
	Fourth District	73	8.3	41	6.9
	Outside Alaska	40	4.6	11	1.8
<b>Gender</b>					
	No response	11	1.3	9	1.5
	Male	519	59.3	324	54.2
	Female	342	39.1	263	44.0
	Another identity	3	0.3	2	0.3

## *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.

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

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

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

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

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

## *Confidentiality and Data Safety*

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a locked office. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

## ***Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding***

To ensure that as few duplicates or invalid surveys as possible were received, clear instructions were provided to potential paper survey respondents regarding how to handle the survey booklets:

*“A postage-paid business reply envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluations. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked “Confidential,” and seal the envelope. Then use the business reply envelope, being sure to sign in the space provided. The return envelope MUST BE SIGNED in order for your survey to be counted.”*

Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. For the surveys returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

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

## ***Data Management***

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper surveys were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

## ***Results***

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents’ level of experience with each applicant rated is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the applicants. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.

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

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

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



## ***Ratings of Applicants***

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-24 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>Kate Demarest</b>	145	16.6	66.9	22.1	11.0
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	115	13.1	74.8	13.9	11.3
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	152	17.4	73.0	17.1	9.9
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	190	21.7	77.4	20.5	2.1
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	115	13.1	69.6	12.2	18.3
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	92	10.5	84.8	14.1	1.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	118	13.5	83.9	8.5	7.6

**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>Kate Demarest</b>	144	4.1	4.0	1.0	97	4.2	5.0	1.0
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	114	4.4	5.0	0.8	85	4.4	5.0	0.8
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	150	4.4	5.0	0.9	110	4.4	5.0	0.9
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	188	4.3	5.0	1.0	146	4.3	5.0	0.9
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	110	4.4	5.0	0.9	78	4.4	5.0	0.9
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	90	3.8	4.0	1.1	77	3.8	4.0	1.1
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	117	3.9	4.0	1.1	99	4.0	4.0	1.1

**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>Kate Demarest</b>	97	2	2.1	3	3.1	18	18.6	25	25.8	49	50.5
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	85	-	-	2	2.4	8	9.4	26	30.6	49	57.6
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	110	2	1.8	3	2.7	10	9.1	28	25.5	67	60.9
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	146	1	0.7	9	6.2	15	10.3	36	24.7	85	58.2
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	78	-	-	5	6.4	7	9.0	19	24.4	47	60.3
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	77	2	2.6	9	11.7	16	20.8	25	32.5	25	32.5
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	99	3	3.0	6	6.1	20	20.2	31	31.3	39	39.4

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>Kate Demarest</b>	6	3.7	6	2.7	21	4.1	3	4.7	16	4.1	40	4.5	1	5.0	3	4.7	1	4.0	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	7	4.3	3	4.3	2	4.5	-	-	21	4.3	43	4.5	4	4.5	5	4.4	-	-	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	8	3.6	5	3.8	16	4.3	2	5.0	19	4.2	53	4.6	2	4.0	5	4.8	-	-	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	14	3.8	5	4.2	25	4.5	3	4.3	27	4.3	55	4.5	4	2.5	11	4.6	2	4.5	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	14	4.1	10	4.1	15	4.8	2	5.0	17	4.5	11	4.5	2	2.5	6	4.3	-	-	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	32	3.7	10	4.3	3	3.3	-	-	18	3.9	8	3.6	1	4.0	5	4.0	-	-	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	8	4.5	8	3.6	17	3.9	-	-	17	3.7	41	4.1	3	4.3	4	4.3	-	-	4.0

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

**Table 7**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice**

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Kate Demarest</b>	4	3.8	19	4.2	13	4.4	13	4.3	46	4.1	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	7	4.7	16	4.5	14	4.6	13	4.2	33	4.4	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	10	4.9	19	4.4	18	4.4	18	4.3	43	4.4	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	4	4.8	22	4.2	22	4.4	24	4.3	71	4.3	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	5	4.4	9	3.9	6	4.7	14	4.7	42	4.3	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	3	4.3	5	3.8	5	3.6	13	3.6	48	3.8	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	5	4.4	11	4.0	25	4.0	19	3.7	38	4.0	4.0

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

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

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Kate Demarest</b>	3	3.3	1	5.0	27	3.9	65	4.3	1	5.0	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	4	4.0	4	4.3	28	4.3	43	4.5	6	4.7	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	28	4.6	12	4.7	36	4.2	31	4.5	3	3.3	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	9	4.7	1	3.0	35	4.1	96	4.4	5	3.8	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	1	5.0	2	4.5	20	4.4	53	4.4	2	5.0	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	4	3.5	3	3.0	29	3.9	38	3.8	3	4.3	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	12	3.6	13	4.7	38	4.0	30	3.8	6	3.7	4.0

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

**Table 9**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice**

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Kate Demarest</b>	8	4.5	-	-	85	4.2	3	4.3	1	5.0	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	5	4.4	2	4.0	74	4.5	4	4.3	-	-	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	8	4.4	3	5.0	93	4.4	5	4.6	1	5.0	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	28	4.4	1	2.0	112	4.4	4	3.5	1	5.0	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	3	5.0	-	-	71	4.3	3	5.0	1	5.0	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	2	3.5	-	-	73	3.8	2	4.0	-	-	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	4	3.8	4	4.3	86	4.0	4	4.3	1	5.0	4.0

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



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

	Male		Female		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>Kate Demarest</b>	50	4.1	47	4.3	-	-	4.2
<b>Laura Hartz</b>	28	4.6	57	4.4	-	-	4.4
<b>Jack R. McKenna</b>	68	4.4	42	4.5	-	-	4.4
<b>Margaret Paton Walsh</b>	77	4.2	69	4.4	-	-	4.3
<b>Christina Rankin</b>	44	4.3	33	4.4	-	-	4.4
<b>Ian Wheelles</b>	44	4.1	32	3.4	-	-	3.8
<b>Matt Widmer</b>	59	3.9	40	4.0	-	-	4.0

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

**Table 11**  
**Kate Demarest**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	97	66.9
Professional reputation	32	22.1
Other personal contacts	16	11.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	91	93.8
Substantial amount of experience	36	37.1
Moderate amount of experience	32	33.0
Limited amount of experience	29	29.9
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	12	8.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	28	19.3
Private, corporate employee	5	3.4
Judge or judicial officer	21	14.5
Government	54	37.2
Public service agency or organization	7	4.8
Retired	5	3.4
Other	1	0.7
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	2.8
5 years or fewer	6	4.1
6 to 10 years	28	19.3
11 to 15 years	21	14.5
16 to 20 years	25	17.2
More than 20 years	61	42.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Prosecution	10	6.9
Criminal	3	2.1
Mixed criminal & civil	34	23.4
Civil	91	62.8
Other	6	4.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.7
First District	14	9.7
Second District	1	0.7
Third District	124	85.5
Fourth District	4	2.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Male	66	45.5
Female	78	53.8
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 12**  
**Kate Demarest**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	145	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	91	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	6	4.2	4.0	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	32	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	29	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.0
Professional reputation	32	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8
Other personal contacts	16	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	6	4.5	4.3	3.7	4.2	3.2	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	2.7	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1
Private, corporate employee	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7
Judge or judicial officer	16	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Government	40	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	3	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.7
Other	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8
6 to 10 years	19	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
11 to 15 years	13	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4
16 to 20 years	13	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
More than 20 years	46	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	3	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.3
Criminal	1	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	27	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.9
Civil	65	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	8	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.5
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	85	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.2
Fourth District	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	50	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
Female	47	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 13**  
**Laura Hartz**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	86	74.8
Professional reputation	16	13.9
Other personal contacts	13	11.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	79	91.9
Substantial amount of experience	39	45.3
Moderate amount of experience	34	39.5
Limited amount of experience	13	15.1
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	8.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	5.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	7.8
Private, corporate employee	2	1.7
Judge or judicial officer	22	19.1
Government	53	46.1
Public service agency or organization	7	6.1
Retired	6	5.2
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.7
5 years or fewer	9	7.8
6 to 10 years	19	16.5
11 to 15 years	24	20.9
16 to 20 years	23	20.0
More than 20 years	38	33.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	8.7
Criminal	4	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	30	26.1
Civil	64	55.7
Other	7	6.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	7	6.1
Second District	2	1.7
Third District	102	88.7
Fourth District	4	3.5
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	45	39.1
Female	70	60.9
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 14**  
**Laura Hartz**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	115	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	79	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	7	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.6	3.7	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	39	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	34	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5	3.9	4.1
Limited amount of experience	13	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	3.9	4.0
Professional reputation	16	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.0
Other personal contacts	13	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	21	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.0	4.3
Government	44	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.5
Public service agency or organization	4	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.5
Retired	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.0	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	8	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.4	4.7
6 to 10 years	16	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
11 to 15 years	14	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.6
16 to 20 years	13	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.5	3.9	4.2
More than 20 years	33	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Criminal	4	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.8	3.5	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.3
Civil	44	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.5
Other	6	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Second District	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
Third District	75	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Fourth District	4	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	29	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.6
Female	57	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 15**  
**Jack R. McKenna**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	111	73.0
Professional reputation	26	17.1
Other personal contacts	15	9.9
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	96	86.5
Substantial amount of experience	50	45.0
Moderate amount of experience	39	35.1
Limited amount of experience	22	19.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	13	8.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	8.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	13.8
Private, corporate employee	4	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	21	13.8
Government	65	42.8
Public service agency or organization	6	3.9
Retired	9	5.9
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.3
5 years or fewer	12	7.9
6 to 10 years	28	18.4
11 to 15 years	31	20.4
16 to 20 years	26	17.1
More than 20 years	53	34.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	29	19.1
Criminal	12	7.9
Mixed criminal & civil	44	28.9
Civil	60	39.5
Other	7	4.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	10	6.6
Second District	3	2.0
Third District	133	87.5
Fourth District	5	3.3
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	86	56.6
Female	66	43.4
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 16**  
**Jack R. McKenna**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	152	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	96	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	15	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	50	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	39	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Limited amount of experience	22	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	26	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	15	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.4
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	9	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.3
Private, corporate employee	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	19	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.2
Government	53	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0
Retired	5	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	10	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.9
6 to 10 years	20	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4
11 to 15 years	18	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
16 to 20 years	18	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
More than 20 years	43	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	28	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6
Criminal	12	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	37	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2
Civil	31	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.5
Other	3	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	8	4.6	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Second District	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Third District	94	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	5	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.6
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	68	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Female	43	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 17**  
**Margaret Paton Walsh**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	147	77.4
Professional reputation	39	20.5
Other personal contacts	4	2.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	120	81.6
Substantial amount of experience	63	42.9
Moderate amount of experience	49	33.3
Limited amount of experience	35	23.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	19	10.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	34	17.9
Private, corporate employee	5	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	34	17.9
Government	66	34.7
Public service agency or organization	5	2.6
Retired	16	8.4
Other	2	1.1
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	2.1
5 years or fewer	7	3.7
6 to 10 years	25	13.2
11 to 15 years	27	14.2
16 to 20 years	33	17.4
More than 20 years	94	49.5
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	13	6.8
Criminal	2	1.1
Mixed criminal & civil	42	22.1
Civil	126	66.3
Other	7	3.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	33	17.4
Second District	1	0.5
Third District	149	78.4
Fourth District	5	2.6
Outside Alaska	2	1.1
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.5
Male	97	51.1
Female	92	48.4
Another identity	-	-

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



**Table 18**  
**Margaret Paton Walsh**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	190	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	120	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	27	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	63	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	49	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.4
Limited amount of experience	35	4.7	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.0
Professional reputation	39	4.5	4.2	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.9
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.8
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	26	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.5
Private, corporate employee	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Judge or judicial officer	27	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.3
Government	55	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.5
Public service agency or organization	4	4.0	3.8	2.8	2.3	2.8	2.5
Retired	11	4.9	4.7	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.6
Other	2	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.0	4.5
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	4	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.8	4.8
6 to 10 years	22	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.2
11 to 15 years	22	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.5	4.4
16 to 20 years	24	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.3
More than 20 years	72	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.7
Criminal	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	35	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
Civil	97	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.4
Other	5	4.2	3.4	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.8
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	28	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.4
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
Third District	113	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
Fourth District	4	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.0	4.3	3.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	78	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Female	69	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 19**  
**Christina Rankin**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	80	69.6
Professional reputation	14	12.2
Other personal contacts	21	18.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	78.2
Substantial amount of experience	27	34.2
Moderate amount of experience	32	40.5
Limited amount of experience	20	25.3
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.9
Private, solo	14	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	13.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	16.5
Private, corporate employee	3	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	20	17.4
Government	29	25.2
Public service agency or organization	5	4.3
Retired	8	7.0
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.7
5 years or fewer	6	5.2
6 to 10 years	12	10.4
11 to 15 years	16	13.9
16 to 20 years	26	22.6
More than 20 years	53	46.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	5.2
Criminal	2	1.7
Mixed criminal & civil	27	23.5
Civil	74	64.3
Other	6	5.2
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	5	4.3
Second District	1	0.9
Third District	103	89.6
Fourth District	4	3.5
Outside Alaska	2	1.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.9
Male	64	55.7
Female	50	43.5
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 20**  
**Christina Rankin**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	115	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	61	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	17	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	27	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	32	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
Limited amount of experience	20	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	14	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Other personal contacts	21	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	15	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.8
Private, corporate employee	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.5
Government	12	4.6	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.5
Public service agency or organization	2	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.5
Retired	7	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.4
6 to 10 years	9	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.9
11 to 15 years	7	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.2	4.5	4.7
16 to 20 years	14	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7
More than 20 years	43	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Criminal	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	20	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4
Civil	55	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	71	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	46	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
Female	33	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 21**  
**Ian Wheelles**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	78	84.8
Professional reputation	13	14.1
Other personal contacts	1	1.1
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	66	84.6
Substantial amount of experience	19	24.4
Moderate amount of experience	33	42.3
Limited amount of experience	26	33.3
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	1.1
Private, solo	34	37.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	10.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	20	21.7
Government	12	13.0
Public service agency or organization	4	4.3
Retired	7	7.6
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	4.3
5 years or fewer	3	3.3
6 to 10 years	8	8.7
11 to 15 years	8	8.7
16 to 20 years	16	17.4
More than 20 years	53	57.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	6.5
Criminal	5	5.4
Mixed criminal & civil	31	33.7
Civil	46	50.0
Other	4	4.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	2	2.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	88	95.7
Fourth District	2	2.2
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	1.1
Male	55	59.8
Female	36	39.1
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 22**  
**Ian Wheelles**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	92	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>
Experience within last 5 years	66	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	12	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.2
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	33	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Limited amount of experience	26	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.2	3.5
Professional reputation	13	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	32	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.4	3.7	3.9
Government	8	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.6
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	5	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.0	4.3
6 to 10 years	5	3.6	4.0	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8
11 to 15 years	6	3.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.4	3.6
16 to 20 years	13	3.7	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.6
More than 20 years	48	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	4	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.5
Criminal	4	2.5	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	29	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.9
Civil	38	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
Other	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	74	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
Fourth District	2	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	45	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1
Female	32	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 23**  
**Matt Widmer**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	99	83.9
Professional reputation	10	8.5
Other personal contacts	9	7.6
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	76	76.8
Substantial amount of experience	41	41.8
Moderate amount of experience	34	34.7
Limited amount of experience	23	23.5
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.7
Private, solo	11	9.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	18	15.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	19	16.1
Government	50	42.4
Public service agency or organization	4	3.4
Retired	5	4.2
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	2	1.7
5 years or fewer	7	5.9
6 to 10 years	13	11.0
11 to 15 years	29	24.6
16 to 20 years	21	17.8
More than 20 years	46	39.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	1	0.8
Prosecution	14	11.9
Criminal	17	14.4
Mixed criminal & civil	40	33.9
Civil	40	33.9
Other	6	5.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.8
First District	4	3.4
Second District	4	3.4
Third District	103	87.3
Fourth District	4	3.4
Outside Alaska	2	1.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	1	0.8
Male	69	58.5
Female	48	40.7
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 24**  
**Matt Widmer**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperamen t <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall I <i>M</i>
All respondents	118	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	76	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	23	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	41	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	34	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.8
Limited amount of experience	23	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	10	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.6
Other personal contacts	9	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.6
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	8	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	17	3.9	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.0	3.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.7
Government	41	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1
Public service agency or organization	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
Retired	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4
6 to 10 years	11	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	25	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.0
16 to 20 years	19	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.7
More than 20 years	38	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	12	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.6
Criminal	13	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	38	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0
Civil	30	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8
Other	6	4.0	4.3	4.2	3.8	3.5	3.7
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.8
Second District	4	4.3	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.5	4.3
Third District	86	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0
Fourth District	4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	59	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.9
Female	40	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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