



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Alaska Supreme Court

Technical Report

Staci Corey, M.S., Project Manager
Elizabeth Williams, Undergraduate Research Assistant
Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Assistant Professor

January 21, 2016

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	1
Introduction.....	2
Methodology	2
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	7
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants.....	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Practice.....	10
Table 6: Mean Scores on Overall Rating of Applicants by Length of Alaska Practice.....	11
Table 7: Mean Scores on Overall Rating of Applicants by Caseload Handled	12
Table 8: Mean Scores on Overall Rating of Applicants by Location of Practice.....	13
Table 9: Mean Scores on Overall Rating of Applicants by Gender.....	14
<i>Applicant Tables</i>	
Table 10: Ruth Botstein: Demographic Description of Respondents	15
Table 11: Ruth Botstein: Detailed Information on Responses.....	16
Table 12: Susan M. Carney: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	17
Table 13: Susan M. Carney: Detailed Information on Responses	18
Table 14: Kevin G. Clarkson: Demographic Description of Respondents	19
Table 15: Kevin G. Clarkson: Detailed Information on Responses.....	20
Table 16: Andrew Guidi: Demographic Description of Respondents	21
Table 17: Andrew Guidi: Detailed Information on Responses.....	22
Table 18: Jahna Lindemuth: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	23
Table 19: Jahna Lindemuth: Detailed Information on Responses	24
Table 20: Philip Pallenberg: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	25
Table 21: Philip Pallenberg: Detailed Information on Responses	26
Table 22: Paul A. Roetman: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	27
Table 23: Paul A. Roetman: Detailed Information on Responses	28
Table 24: David Avraham Voluck: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	29
Table 25: David Avraham Voluck: Detailed Information on Responses	30

Executive Summary

This selection survey was conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Alaska Supreme Court created by the impending retirement of Justice Dana Fabe. By the application deadline, the Council received eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Ruth Botstein; Susan M. Carney; Kevin G. Clarkson; Andrew Guidi; Jahna Lindemuth; Philip Pallenberg; Paul A. Roetman; and David Avraham Voluck.

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

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

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants
Alaska Supreme Court

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
Ruth Botstein	118	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
Susan M. Carney	130	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.5
Kevin G. Clarkson	124	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.7
Andrew Guidi	291	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Jahna Lindemuth	143	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1
Philip Pallenberg	197	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	147	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.1	3.2
David Avraham Voluck	54	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.2	3.3

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

Judicial Selection Survey: Alaska Supreme Court

Introduction

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

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Center for Behavioral Health Research and Services (CBHRS), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. CBHRS was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Judicial Council but returned directly to CBHRS for processing, data entry, and analysis. CBHRS prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

This selection survey was conducted for one judicial vacancy on the Alaska Supreme Court created by the impending retirement of Justice Dana Fabe. By the application deadline, the Council had received eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Ruth Botstein; Susan M. Carney; Kevin G. Clarkson; Andrew Guidi; Jahna Lindemuth; Philip Pallenberg; Paul A. Roetman; and David Avraham Voluck.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this 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 2,926 individuals invited to participate, the vast majority of individuals (2,726) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Eighty-five individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 115 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 915 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. One online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. In that case, the paper survey was more complete and was retained while the online survey was removed from analyses. Therefore, 914 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 36 paper surveys. No paper surveys were unsigned. No paper surveys were excluded either because the respondents answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out on Professional Rule 8.2 or because they left that

question blank. One paper survey was returned by an individual who also completed the online survey. In that one case, the paper survey was more complete and was retained while the online survey was removed from analyses. Therefore, all 36 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 914 online surveys and 36 paper surveys, for a total of 950 surveys and a survey return rate of 32.5%. Of the 950 returned surveys, 239 did not rate any of the eight applicants; 711 (24.3%) of those invited to complete the survey evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics
Alaska Supreme Court

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	All respondents	950	100.0	711	100.0
Type of Practice					
	No response	42	4.4	6	0.8
	Private, solo	181	19.1	131	18.4
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	133	14.0	100	14.1
	Private, 6+ attorneys	129	13.6	99	13.9
	Private, corporate employee	31	3.3	23	3.2
	Judge or judicial officer	82	8.6	72	10.1
	Government	277	29.2	228	32.1
	Public service agency or organization	36	3.8	25	3.5
	Retired	29	3.1	19	2.7
	Other	10	1.1	8	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	59	6.2	17	2.4
	5 years or fewer	119	12.5	82	11.5
	6 to 10 years	99	10.4	72	10.1
	11 to 15 years	96	10.1	83	11.7
	16 to 20 years	84	8.8	69	9.7
	More than 20 years	493	51.9	388	54.6
Cases Handled					
	No response	47	4.9	6	0.8
	Prosecution	51	5.4	37	5.2
	Criminal	78	8.2	60	8.4
	Mixed criminal & civil	175	18.4	149	21.0
	Civil	514	54.1	405	57.0
	Other	85	8.9	54	7.6
Location of Practice					
	No response	50	5.3	10	1.4
	First District	115	12.1	103	14.5
	Second District	17	1.8	15	2.1
	Third District	632	66.5	501	70.5
	Fourth District	95	10.0	70	9.8
	Outside Alaska	41	4.3	12	1.7
Gender					
	No response	51	5.4	10	1.4
	Male	545	57.4	416	58.5
	Female	354	37.3	285	40.1

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:

“Attached is the bar survey for applicants for the current vacancy on the Alaska Supreme Court. 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>
<i>Professional Competence</i>	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
<i>Integrity</i>	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
<i>Fairness</i>	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
<i>Judicial Temperament</i>	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
<i>Suitability of Experience</i>	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
<i>Overall Rating</i>	Has few qualifications for this position	Has insufficient qualifications for this position	Has suitable qualifications for this position	Has highly suitable qualifications for this position	Has exceptionally high qualifications for this position

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at CBHRS and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the

judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, CBHRS has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a secure data storage room. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

Based on these instructions, CBHRS implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. If a survey had been returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope would have been 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.

Had any paper surveys been returned without signatures, with illegible signatures, or without being on the mailing list they would have been excluded from the data entry and analysis and not reflected in the total number of surveys received. No surveys were returned that were not on the list or signed.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once, and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. After merging online and entered paper data, CBHRS analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. One duplicate survey was identified. For each set of duplicate surveys, the most complete survey data was retained and the duplicate removed, ensuring that only one survey per respondent was used in the data analysis.

Data Management

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, CBHRS implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. Before entry, all paper data was reviewed and cleaned prior to data entry. Then, a second staff member confirmed all data cleaning and entered the surveys. After the paper surveys were entered, the first staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes. Online data were downloaded from the

survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents' level of experience with each applicant rated is shown. Second, ratings and comparisons of the applicants are provided in a variety of ways. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on a very small number of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results for the applicant.

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 10-25 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Respondents' Level of Experience with the Applicants
Alaska Supreme Court

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Ruth Botstein	174	18.3	67.8	21.8	10.3
Susan M. Carney	198	20.8	65.7	28.8	5.6
Kevin G. Clarkson	237	24.9	52.3	43.0	4.6
Andrew Guidi	337	35.5	86.4	12.2	1.5
Jahna Lindemuth	215	22.6	66.5	25.1	8.4
Philip Pallenberg	258	27.2	76.4	18.6	5.0
Paul A. Roetman	172	18.1	85.5	12.2	2.3
David Avraham Voluck	109	11.5	49.5	33.0	17.4

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings
Alaska Supreme Court

	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>
Ruth Botstein	171	3.8	4.0	1.1	117	3.8	4.0	1.1
Susan M. Carney	196	4.4	5.0	1.0	130	4.5	5.0	1.0
Kevin G. Clarkson	233	2.6	2.0	1.2	123	2.7	2.0	1.3
Andrew Guidi	333	4.3	5.0	1.0	287	4.3	5.0	1.0
Jahna Lindemuth	208	4.0	4.0	1.1	140	4.1	4.0	1.1
Philip Pallenberg	254	4.2	5.0	1.0	195	4.2	5.0	1.0
Paul A. Roetman	171	3.2	3.0	1.2	146	3.2	3.0	1.2
David Avraham Voluck	107	3.2	3.0	1.3	54	3.3	3.0	1.4

Table 5
Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Practice
Alaska Supreme Court

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
R. Botstein	15	3.2	5	3.4	13	3.7	2	3.0	8	3.5	62	4.2	4	2.5	7	3.3	3.8
S. M. Carney	18	4.6	14	4.7	14	4.4	-	-	24	4.4	49	4.4	5	4.6	5	4.4	4.5
K. G. Clarkson	23	2.6	20	3.2	33	2.9	3	2.3	13	2.5	19	2.4	4	2.3	6	2.5	2.7
A. Guidi	52	4.1	68	4.4	59	4.3	4	4.8	33	4.4	54	4.3	8	3.8	5	4.4	4.3
J. Lindemuth	23	3.7	15	4.1	43	4.0	11	4.5	12	4.2	27	3.9	3	5.0	3	4.7	4.1
P. Pallenberg	36	4.3	29	4.0	13	3.9	-	-	35	4.4	65	4.2	9	4.7	6	3.3	4.2
P. A. Roetman	22	3.2	14	3.9	10	2.9	-	-	35	3.3	56	3.0	3	2.7	4	3.0	3.2
D. A. Voluck	10	3.0	3	3.3	5	2.8	1	3.0	10	2.6	14	3.3	5	4.8	3	4.7	3.3

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

Table 6
Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Length of Alaska Practice
Alaska Supreme Court

	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>	
R. Botstein	12	4.3	16	4.3	13	4.3	11	3.2	60	3.5	3.8
S. M. Carney	11	4.6	14	4.4	17	4.5	14	4.4	71	4.5	4.5
K. G. Clarkson	1	2.0	4	2.8	4	2.0	10	2.5	98	2.7	2.7
A. Guidi	18	4.2	20	4.4	24	4.3	25	3.9	194	4.3	4.3
J. Lindemuth	4	5.0	10	4.2	14	4.4	14	4.1	93	4.0	4.1
P. Pallenberg	15	4.5	14	4.3	11	4.2	18	4.4	134	4.1	4.2
P. A. Roetman	6	3.7	15	3.1	17	3.3	24	3.5	77	3.0	3.2
D. A. Voluck	6	3.3	4	4.3	10	3.7	4	3.5	28	3.1	3.3

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

Table 7
Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Caseload Handled
Alaska Supreme Court

	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>	
R. Botstein	5	3.2	6	3.8	15	3.6	82	3.8	7	4.4	3.8
S. M. Carney	13	4.3	23	4.9	51	4.6	36	4.3	5	3.8	4.5
K. G. Clarkson	1	4.0	3	3.0	26	2.5	84	2.7	6	2.8	2.7
A. Guidi	5	4.8	7	4.1	68	4.2	188	4.3	17	4.7	4.3
J. Lindemuth	6	3.3	5	4.4	20	4.1	101	4.0	7	4.6	4.1
P. Pallenberg	7	4.0	20	4.6	59	4.3	91	4.2	16	3.9	4.2
P. A. Roetman	17	3.5	17	2.8	62	3.2	41	3.1	8	3.4	3.2
D. A. Voluck	1	5.0	3	3.0	12	2.8	31	3.5	5	4.2	3.3

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

Table 8
Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Location of Practice
Alaska Supreme Court

	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>	
R. Botstein	13	3.9	-	-	97	3.8	3	3.0	1	5.0	3.8
S. M. Carney	4	4.5	4	3.5	68	4.4	50	4.7	1	4.0	4.5
K. G. Clarkson	5	2.8	-	-	109	2.7	2	2.0	2	2.5	2.7
A. Guidi	13	4.0	1	4.0	259	4.3	9	3.9	2	4.5	4.3
J. Lindemuth	4	4.0	-	-	126	4.1	8	3.0	-	-	4.1
P. Pallenberg	79	4.4	1	4.0	106	4.1	6	3.8	-	-	4.2
P. A. Roetman	10	2.4	11	3.9	112	3.1	12	3.8	-	-	3.2
D. A. Voluck	16	3.6	3	4.7	29	3.2	2	2.0	1	5.0	3.3

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

Table 9
Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Respondent Gender
Alaska Supreme Court

	Male		Female		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
R. Botstein	56	3.6	58	4.0	3.8
S. M. Carney	72	4.6	54	4.4	4.5
K. G. Clarkson	85	2.8	34	2.4	2.7
A. Guidi	188	4.4	94	4.1	4.3
J. Lindemuth	93	4.1	44	4.1	4.1
P. Pallenberg	111	4.1	82	4.3	4.2
P. A. Roetman	87	3.3	58	3.0	3.2
D. A. Voluck	32	3.1	20	3.8	3.3

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

Table 10
Ruth Botstein
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	174	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	118	67.8
Professional reputation	38	21.8
Other personal contacts	18	10.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	100	84.7
Substantial amount of experience	38	32.2
Moderate amount of experience	41	34.7
Limited amount of experience	39	33.1
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.0
Private, solo	23	13.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	5.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	28	16.1
Private, corporate employee	6	3.4
Judge or judicial officer	11	6.3
Government	81	46.6
Public service agency or organization	6	3.4
Retired	7	4.0
Other	1	0.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	2.9
5 years or fewer	17	9.8
6 to 10 years	19	10.9
11 to 15 years	21	12.1
16 to 20 years	18	10.3
More than 20 years	94	54.0
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.1
Prosecution	7	4.0
Criminal	10	5.7
Mixed criminal & civil	22	12.6
Civil	118	67.8
Other	15	8.6
Location of Practice		
No response	3	1.7
First District	16	9.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	149	85.6
Fourth District	4	2.3
Outside Alaska	2	1.1
Gender		
No response	3	1.7
Male	82	47.1
Female	89	51.1

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

Table 11
Ruth Botstein
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	174	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	118	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	100	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	13	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.2	3.5
Substantial amount of experience	38	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	41	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.7
Limited amount of experience	39	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.7	3.2	3.5
Professional reputation	38	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.7
Other personal contacts	18	4.2	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.6	3.8
Type of Practice*							
No response	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Private, solo	15	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.0	3.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.7	3.6	3.7
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.3	4.7	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.5
Government	62	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.2
Public service agency or organization	4	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.3	2.5	2.5
Retired	7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.3	3.0	3.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	5	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
5 years or fewer	12	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.4	4.0	4.3
6 to 10 years	16	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.5	3.9	4.3
11 to 15 years	13	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.3
16 to 20 years	11	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.0	3.2
More than 20 years	61	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.3	3.5
Cases Handled*							
No response	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.5	3.0
Prosecution	5	4.4	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2
Criminal	6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	15	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.4	3.6
Civil	83	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
Other	7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.1	4.4
Location of Practice*							
No response	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7
First District	13	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.5	3.9
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	98	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
Fourth District	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
No response	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7
Male	57	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.6
Female	58	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	3.6	4.0

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

Table 12
Susan M. Carney
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	198	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	130	65.7
Professional reputation	57	28.8
Other personal contacts	11	5.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	107	82.3
Substantial amount of experience	52	40.0
Moderate amount of experience	53	40.8
Limited amount of experience	24	18.5
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.0
Private, solo	32	16.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	8.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	23	11.6
Private, corporate employee	3	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	32	16.2
Government	73	36.9
Public service agency or organization	7	3.5
Retired	9	4.5
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	2.0
5 years or fewer	15	7.6
6 to 10 years	17	8.6
11 to 15 years	26	13.1
16 to 20 years	23	11.6
More than 20 years	113	57.1
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.0
Prosecution	15	7.6
Criminal	36	18.2
Mixed criminal & civil	65	32.8
Civil	72	36.4
Other	8	4.0
Location of Practice		
No response	3	1.5
First District	9	4.5
Second District	5	2.5
Third District	117	59.1
Fourth District	63	31.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.5
Gender		
No response	4	2.0
Male	104	52.5
Female	90	45.5

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

Table 13
Susan M. Carney
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	198	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	130	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	107	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	17	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.8
Substantial amount of experience	52	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	53	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	24	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.2
Professional reputation	57	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1
Other personal contacts	11	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5	3.9	4.5
Type of Practice*							
No response	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, solo	18	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	24	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Government	49	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.4	4.4	4.6
Retired	5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.4
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
5 years or fewer	11	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.6
6 to 10 years	14	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.4
11 to 15 years	17	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5
16 to 20 years	14	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.4
More than 20 years	71	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.5
Cases Handled*							
No response	2	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Prosecution	13	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.3
Criminal	23	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	51	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.6
Civil	36	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.3
Other	5	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.8
Location of Practice*							
No response	3	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
First District	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Second District	4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Third District	68	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4
Fourth District	50	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.7
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Gender*							
No response	4	3.5	4.3	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.8
Male	72	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.6
Female	54	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4

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

Table 14
Kevin G. Clarkson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	237	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	124	52.3
Professional reputation	102	43.0
Other personal contacts	11	4.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	91	73.4
Substantial amount of experience	23	18.5
Moderate amount of experience	52	41.9
Limited amount of experience	48	38.7
Type of Practice		
No response	2	0.8
Private, solo	50	21.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	34	14.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	50	21.1
Private, corporate employee	10	4.2
Judge or judicial officer	23	9.7
Government	46	19.4
Public service agency or organization	8	3.4
Retired	11	4.6
Other	3	1.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	3.0
5 years or fewer	3	1.3
6 to 10 years	8	3.4
11 to 15 years	18	7.6
16 to 20 years	21	8.9
More than 20 years	180	75.9
Cases Handled		
No response	3	1.3
Prosecution	3	1.3
Criminal	14	5.9
Mixed criminal & civil	42	17.7
Civil	157	66.2
Other	18	7.6
Location of Practice		
No response	5	2.1
First District	12	5.1
Second District	-	-
Third District	211	89.0
Fourth District	6	2.5
Outside Alaska	3	1.3
Gender		
No response	5	2.1
Male	150	63.3
Female	82	34.6

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

Table 15
Kevin G. Clarkson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	237	3.3	3.1	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	124	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.7
Experience within last 5 years	91	3.4	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8
Experience not within last 5 years	31	3.1	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.5
Substantial amount of experience	23	3.4	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.7
Moderate amount of experience	52	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8
Limited amount of experience	48	3.3	3.2	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7
Professional reputation	102	3.1	3.0	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.4
Other personal contacts	11	4.0	3.2	2.6	2.7	3.3	2.6
Type of Practice*							
No response	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, solo	23	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	20	3.5	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	33	3.5	3.5	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.9
Private, corporate employee	3	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	1.5	2.3
Judge or judicial officer	14	3.4	3.2	2.3	2.8	2.7	2.5
Government	19	2.9	3.1	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.4
Public service agency or organization	4	3.5	3.3	2.5	2.0	2.8	2.3
Retired	6	3.7	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.8	2.5
Other	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	6	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.7
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
6 to 10 years	4	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.8
11 to 15 years	4	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.8	2.0
16 to 20 years	10	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.5
More than 20 years	99	3.4	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7
Cases Handled*							
No response	3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Prosecution	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Criminal	4	3.3	3.3	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	26	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.5
Civil	84	3.4	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7
Other	6	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8
Location of Practice*							
No response	5	3.8	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
First District	5	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.4	3.0	2.8
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	110	3.4	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.7
Fourth District	2	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Outside Alaska	2	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5
Gender*							
No response	4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0
Male	86	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8
Female	34	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.7	2.4

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

Table 16
Andrew Guidi
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	337	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	291	86.4
Professional reputation	41	12.2
Other personal contacts	5	1.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	249	85.6
Substantial amount of experience	97	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	120	41.2
Limited amount of experience	72	24.7
Type of Practice		
No response	3	0.9
Private, solo	63	18.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	73	21.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	67	19.9
Private, corporate employee	7	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	35	10.4
Government	70	20.8
Public service agency or organization	11	3.3
Retired	7	2.1
Other	1	0.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	8	2.4
5 years or fewer	23	6.8
6 to 10 years	22	6.5
11 to 15 years	25	7.4
16 to 20 years	30	8.9
More than 20 years	229	68.0
Cases Handled		
No response	2	0.6
Prosecution	9	2.7
Criminal	12	3.6
Mixed criminal & civil	75	22.3
Civil	218	64.7
Other	21	6.2
Location of Practice		
No response	4	1.2
First District	15	4.5
Second District	1	0.3
Third District	300	89.0
Fourth District	14	4.2
Outside Alaska	3	0.9
Gender		
No response	6	1.8
Male	215	63.8
Female	116	34.4

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

Table 17
Andrew Guidi
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	337	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	291	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	249	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	28	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	97	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	120	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.3
Limited amount of experience	72	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	41	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1
Other personal contacts	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Type of Practice*							
No response	3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Private, solo	52	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	70	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	60	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Private, corporate employee	4	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.8
Judge or judicial officer	33	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4
Government	54	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Public service agency or organization	9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8
Retired	5	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.4
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	6	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2
5 years or fewer	20	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.2
6 to 10 years	20	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	24	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.0	4.3
16 to 20 years	26	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.9
More than 20 years	195	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Cases Handled*							
No response	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.0
Prosecution	5	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.8	4.8
Criminal	7	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1
Mixed criminal & civil	70	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.2
Civil	190	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Other	17	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7
Location of Practice*							
No response	3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
First District	13	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.0
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	262	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	10	4.1	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.2	3.9
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Gender*							
No response	6	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.8	4.0	3.6
Male	189	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
Female	96	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1

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

Table 18
Jahna Lindemuth
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	215	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	143	66.5
Professional reputation	54	25.1
Other personal contacts	18	8.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	121	84.6
Substantial amount of experience	55	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	59	41.3
Limited amount of experience	28	19.6
Type of Practice		
No response	2	0.9
Private, solo	34	15.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	23	10.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	61	28.4
Private, corporate employee	16	7.4
Judge or judicial officer	17	7.9
Government	49	22.8
Public service agency or organization	7	3.3
Retired	4	1.9
Other	2	0.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	2.3
5 years or fewer	9	4.2
6 to 10 years	15	7.0
11 to 15 years	23	10.7
16 to 20 years	22	10.2
More than 20 years	141	65.6
Cases Handled		
No response	2	0.9
Prosecution	9	4.2
Criminal	10	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	27	12.6
Civil	154	71.6
Other	13	6.0
Location of Practice		
No response	3	1.4
First District	6	2.8
Second District	-	-
Third District	193	89.8
Fourth District	10	4.7
Outside Alaska	3	1.4
Gender		
No response	3	1.4
Male	130	60.5
Female	82	38.1

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

Table 19
Jahna Lindemuth
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	215	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	143	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	121	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	13	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.6
Substantial amount of experience	55	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	59	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0
Limited amount of experience	28	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.8
Professional reputation	54	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.8
Other personal contacts	18	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.9
Type of Practice*							
No response	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
Private, solo	23	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	45	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0
Private, corporate employee	11	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	12	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.2
Government	28	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.7	4.7	5.0
Retired	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	5	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.6	3.6
5 years or fewer	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0
6 to 10 years	10	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
11 to 15 years	14	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	14	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
More than 20 years	96	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.0
Cases Handled*							
No response	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Prosecution	6	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.2	3.3
Criminal	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	20	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1
Civil	104	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
Other	7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	3.9	4.6
Location of Practice*							
No response	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
First District	4	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.0	3.8	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	129	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Fourth District	8	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
No response	3	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.3	3.3
Male	95	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1
Female	45	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1

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

Table 20
Philip Pallenberg
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	258	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	197	76.4
Professional reputation	48	18.6
Other personal contacts	13	5.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	163	82.7
Substantial amount of experience	75	38.1
Moderate amount of experience	67	34.0
Limited amount of experience	54	27.4
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.4
Private, solo	45	17.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	36	14.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	8.1
Private, corporate employee	1	0.4
Judge or judicial officer	41	15.9
Government	88	34.1
Public service agency or organization	14	5.4
Retired	9	3.5
Other	2	0.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	1.6
5 years or fewer	22	8.5
6 to 10 years	18	7.0
11 to 15 years	17	6.6
16 to 20 years	23	8.9
More than 20 years	174	67.4
Cases Handled		
No response	2	0.8
Prosecution	10	3.9
Criminal	25	9.7
Mixed criminal & civil	70	27.1
Civil	131	50.8
Other	20	7.8
Location of Practice		
No response	3	1.2
First District	94	36.4
Second District	2	0.8
Third District	148	57.4
Fourth District	9	3.5
Outside Alaska	2	0.8
Gender		
No response	3	1.2
Male	151	58.5
Female	104	40.3

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

Table 21
Philip Pallenberg
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	258	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	197	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	163	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	28	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	75	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	67	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Limited amount of experience	54	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
Professional reputation	48	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Other personal contacts	13	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5
Type of Practice*							
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, solo	36	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	29	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	3.9	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	35	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
Government	66	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	10	4.7	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7
Retired	6	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.3
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
5 years or fewer	15	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	15	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
11 to 15 years	11	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.2
16 to 20 years	18	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
More than 20 years	135	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1
Cases Handled*							
No response	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Prosecution	7	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.0
Criminal	20	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	59	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Civil	92	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
Other	17	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	3.9
Location of Practice*							
No response	3	4.3	4.3	4.0	5.0	4.3	4.3
First District	81	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
Second District	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	106	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1
Fourth District	6	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
No response	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.5	3.5
Male	112	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1
Female	83	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3

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

Table 22
Paul A. Roetman
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	172	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	147	85.5
Professional reputation	21	12.2
Other personal contacts	4	2.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	118	80.3
Substantial amount of experience	50	34.0
Moderate amount of experience	61	41.5
Limited amount of experience	35	23.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	27	15.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	8.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	7.0
Private, corporate employee	1	0.6
Judge or judicial officer	38	22.1
Government	69	40.1
Public service agency or organization	3	1.7
Retired	6	3.5
Other	2	1.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	8	4.7
5 years or fewer	6	3.5
6 to 10 years	17	9.9
11 to 15 years	23	13.4
16 to 20 years	26	15.1
More than 20 years	92	53.5
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.6
Prosecution	20	11.6
Criminal	21	12.2
Mixed criminal & civil	71	41.3
Civil	49	28.5
Other	10	5.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
First District	13	7.6
Second District	12	7.0
Third District	129	75.0
Fourth District	17	9.9
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	0.6
Male	104	60.5
Female	67	39.0

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

Table 23
Paul A. Roetman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	172	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	147	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.1	3.2
Experience within last 5 years	118	3.4	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.2	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	24	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.4	2.9	2.8
Substantial amount of experience	50	3.4	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	61	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.2	3.1
Limited amount of experience	35	3.4	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.1	3.2
Professional reputation	21	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.2	2.9	2.9
Other personal contacts	4	3.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.3	3.5
Type of Practice*							
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, solo	22	3.4	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.4	3.8	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	3.1	3.8	3.6	3.8	2.9	2.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	35	3.4	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.2	3.3
Government	56	3.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.0	3.0
Public service agency or organization	3	2.7	4.3	4.0	3.7	2.7	2.7
Retired	4	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.8	2.8	3.0
Other	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	7	3.7	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.4	3.3
5 years or fewer	6	3.7	4.2	3.7	4.0	3.2	3.7
6 to 10 years	15	3.3	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.1
11 to 15 years	17	3.4	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.2	3.3
16 to 20 years	24	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.5	3.5
More than 20 years	78	3.2	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.0	3.0
Cases Handled*							
No response	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
Prosecution	17	3.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.2	3.5
Criminal	17	2.9	3.7	3.2	3.5	2.8	2.8
Mixed criminal & civil	62	3.4	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.1	3.2
Civil	42	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.2	3.1
Other	8	3.4	4.1	3.5	4.1	3.6	3.4
Location of Practice*							
No response	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
First District	10	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.3	2.4
Second District	11	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.7	3.9
Third District	113	3.2	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.1	3.1
Fourth District	12	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.6	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
No response	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Male	87	3.4	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.2	3.3
Female	59	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.0

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

Table 24
David Avraham Voluck
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	109	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	54	49.5
Professional reputation	36	33.0
Other personal contacts	19	17.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	46	85.2
Substantial amount of experience	15	27.8
Moderate amount of experience	16	29.6
Limited amount of experience	23	42.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	23	21.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	7.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	10.1
Private, corporate employee	4	3.7
Judge or judicial officer	16	14.7
Government	30	27.5
Public service agency or organization	9	8.3
Retired	5	4.6
Other	3	2.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	2.8
5 years or fewer	12	11.0
6 to 10 years	12	11.0
11 to 15 years	15	13.8
16 to 20 years	8	7.3
More than 20 years	59	54.1
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.8
Prosecution	3	2.8
Criminal	10	9.2
Mixed criminal & civil	20	18.3
Civil	67	61.5
Other	7	6.4
Location of Practice		
No response	3	2.8
First District	26	23.9
Second District	4	3.7
Third District	67	61.5
Fourth District	7	6.4
Outside Alaska	2	1.8
Gender		
No response	3	2.8
Male	60	55.0
Female	46	42.2

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

Table 25
David Avraham Voluck
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	109	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.0	3.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	54	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.2	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	46	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	7	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.3	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	15	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	3.7	4.2	4.0	3.6	2.9	3.2
Limited amount of experience	23	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	2.8	3.0
Professional reputation	36	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.1
Other personal contacts	19	3.7	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.1	3.3
Type of Practice*							
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, solo	10	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.0	2.9	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.0	3.8	4.0	3.6	2.2	2.8
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	10	3.0	4.1	4.1	3.7	2.6	2.6
Government	14	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.3
Public service agency or organization	5	4.4	5.0	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.8
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.7
Other	3	4.3	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.7	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
No response	2	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	2.0	2.5
5 years or fewer	6	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.3
6 to 10 years	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.0	4.3
11 to 15 years	10	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7
16 to 20 years	4	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.5
More than 20 years	28	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.7	2.9	3.1
Cases Handled*							
No response	2	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.5
Prosecution	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Criminal	3	4.3	4.7	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	12	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.8	2.8
Civil	31	3.7	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.3	3.5
Other	5	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.8	4.2
Location of Practice*							
No response	3	2.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	1.7	2.0
First District	16	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.4	3.6
Second District	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
Third District	29	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.0	3.2
Fourth District	2	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
No response	2	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.5
Male	32	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.0	3.1
Female	20	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.8

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