

# Convention Schedule

Thursday, June 19

10:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.	<b>Effective Advocacy for Judicial Nominations</b> .....	<i>South American B Room</i>
12:00–2:00 p.m.	<b>Student Retreat</b> .....	<i>K&amp;L Gates, 1601 K St, NW</i>
2:30–3:30 p.m.	<b>Speed Networking</b> .....	<i>South American A/B Room</i>
4:00 p.m.	<b>Silent Auction Opens</b> .....	<i>Capital Terrace</i>
4:00–5:30 p.m.	<b>Opening Session</b> .....	<i>Congressional Room</i>

## Making Your Way In-House

This panel explores the possible paths to work in-house, and how to make the most of your career once you get there. Topics of conversation will include advice about academic and early practice preparation for in-house work; opportunities for pro bono work in an in-house setting; diversity initiatives and other opportunities to make change from within a corporation; and other timely questions.

### SPEAKERS

- Fernando A. Bohorquez, Jr.**, *Partner, BakerHostetler*
- Lisa Brown**, *Vice President and General Counsel, Georgetown University*
- Terrance D. Carroll**, *Associate General Counsel, SCL Health System*
- Martha Ann Mazzone**, *Senior Vice President and Deputy General Counsel, Fidelity Investments*
- Michael Strautmanis**, *Vice President of Corporate Citizenship, Walt Disney Company*

5:30–6:30 p.m.	<b>Attendee Welcome Meet-Up</b> .....	<i>Capital Terrace</i>
5:30–6:45 p.m.	<b>VIP Reception*</b> .....	<i>South American A/B Room &amp; Foyer 2</i>
7:00–9:00 p.m.	<b>Gala Dinner</b> .....	<i>Presidential Ballroom</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Remarks by ACS President Caroline Fredrickson</li> <li>▪ Presentation of the David Carliner Public Interest Award</li> <li>▪ Presentation of 2014 Progressive Champion Award to Peter B. Edelman</li> <li>▪ Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor in conversation with Professor Theodore M. Shaw</li> <li>▪ Closing Remarks by ACS Board Chair David Brodsky</li> </ul>	
9:30–11:00 p.m.	<b>Student Chapter Happy Hour</b> .....	<i>BlackFinn Saloon, 1620 I St, NW</i>

\* Invitation only

## Friday, June 20

<b>7:30–9:00 a.m.</b>	<b>Judicial Nominations Task Force Breakfast*</b> .....	<i>South American A/B Room</i>
<b>8:00–9:00 a.m.</b>	<b>Lawyer Chapter Leadership Session</b> .....	<i>Statler A/B Room</i>
<b>9:00 a.m.–7:30 p.m.</b>	<b>Silent Auction</b> .....	<i>Capital Terrace</i>
<b>9:15–10:45 a.m.</b>	<b>Plenary Panel</b> .....	<i>Presidential Ballroom</i>

**“Judicial Activism” Then and Now\***

Fifty years after the apex of the Warren Court, charges that the Supreme Court is “activist” have resurfaced. Justice Ginsburg has opined that “[i]f it’s measured in terms of readiness to overturn legislation, [the Roberts Court] is one of the most activist courts in history.” Of course, judicial activism may be in the eye of the beholder, and may not be an inherently bad thing. Some who once deplored “judicial activism” now call for “judicial engagement.” Is there any difference between the two? What principles of constitutional interpretation can judges employ that both honor their role in our democracy and avoid their substituting personal policy preferences for legislative decisions? Who have been the beneficiaries of judicial intervention over the last fifty years, when, and why? This panel will address these questions by examining the Supreme Court’s jurisprudence with regard to

equal protection, reproductive rights and the First Amendment.

**SPEAKERS**

**Walter Dellinger**, *Partner, Appellate Practice, O’Melveny & Myers*

**Linda Greenhouse**, *Joseph Goldstein Lecturer in Law, Yale Law School*

**Sherrilyn Ifill**, *President and Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF)*

**Clark Neily**, *Senior Attorney, Institute for Justice*

**Geoffrey R. Stone**, *Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School*

**Laurence H. Tribe**, *Carl M. Loeb University Professor, Harvard Law School*

**11:00 a.m.–12:15 p.m. Breakout Sessions****Race and the Law in 2014: Still Separate and Unequal?.....** *South American A/B Room*

60 years after *Brown v. Board* and 50 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act, although de jure segregation has been relegated to the history books, massive disparities persist in the U.S. along racial lines in wealth, employment, education and the criminal justice system. De facto segregation endures in our neighborhoods and public schools. Meanwhile, conservatives continue to advance a jurisprudence that views the Equal Protection Clause as requiring “race-blindness” or “race-neutrality.” What are the implications of such an approach for affirmative action programs and landmark statutes like the Civil Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act that prohibit practices with a disparate impact? How should progressives respond to this view of equal protection? Should we support measures aimed at ameliorating socioeconomic disparities that often

fall along racial lines? In what areas can race potentially be disentangled from class, and in what areas can it not?

**SPEAKERS**

**Tomiko Brown-Nagin**, *Daniel P. S. Paul Professor of Constitutional Law and Professor of History, Harvard University*

**Juan Cartagena**, *President and General Counsel, LatinoJustice PRLDEF*

**Sheryll Cashin**, *Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center*

**Gail Heriot**, *Professor of Law, University of San Diego School of Law; Commissioner, United States Commission on Civil Rights*

**William Yeomans**, *Fellow in Law and Government, American University Washington College of Law*

\* Invitation only; + ACS is a State Bar of California and State Bar of Illinois approved MCLE provider.

Friday, June 20 *continued*11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m. **Breakout Sessions** *continued***The Privatization of America\*** ..... Federal A Room

This panel will explore the question of whether rights are violated by the shift of inherently governmental functions to the private sector. Our prison systems are contracted out; some of our education schemes include vouchers and for-profit charter schools; our regulators are hiring private consultants to help enforce compliance and catch fraud; our federal Medicare systems rely on the insurance industry to determine medical necessity; and our courts are now telling litigants that judicial process is being privatized through arbitration. Are there constitutional or legal lines that are being crossed? How should progressives respond?

**SPEAKERS**

**Kimberly Brown**, Associate Professor of Law,  
University of Baltimore School of Law

**Reuben A. Guttman**, Director, Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.;  
Adjunct Professor and Senior Fellow, Center  
for Advocacy and Dispute Resolution,  
Emory University School of Law

**Jon D. Michaels**, Anne Urowsky Visiting Professor of Law,  
Yale Law School; Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law

**Miriam Seifter**, Visiting Researcher and Adjunct  
Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center

**Paul R. Verkuil**, Chairman, Administrative Conference  
of the United States

**Workers and Their Unions: Knox, Harris and the Aftermath** ..... Federal B Room

This year, the Supreme Court revisited its review of the First Amendment as applied to union dues in the case of *Harris v. Quinn*, where the Court considered the right to collective bargaining by low wage homecare workers. Many consider the case a follow-up to *Knox v. SEIU, Local 1000* and a possible death knell for public employee unions' ability to function as they have for decades. Some have even declared that the case may be the beginning of the end for private sector unions. What does this case really mean for the right of workers to engage in collective action and form unions? What do *Knox* and *Harris* represent with respect to union treatment under the First Amendment, and are different rights afforded to corporate entities? What can workers and

their unions do in response to an unfavorable ruling in *Harris*? And can current labor laws, such as section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act, be strengthened or reimagined to support concerted activity for all workers, both union and nonunion?

**SPEAKERS**

**Nicole Berner**, Associate General Counsel, Service  
Employees International Union (SEIU)

**Catherine Fisk**, Chancellor's Professor of Law,  
University of California Irvine School of Law

**Kent Greenfield**, Professor of Law and Dean's  
Research Scholar, Boston College Law School

**Sarita Gupta**, Executive Director, Jobs With Justice

**Scott A. Kronland**, Partner, Altshuler Berzon LLP

**Protecting Women's Reproductive Health Care in a Hostile Era** ..... Senate Room

In recent years, states have enacted escalating numbers of restrictions on women's reproductive health care, many in the form of targeted regulation of abortion provider (TRAP) laws that shut clinics under the pretense of safeguarding health. In addition, religious objectors are increasingly demanding exemptions from laws protecting access to reproductive health care, including health insurance coverage for contraception. Together these restrictions are dramatically altering women's access to health care. How can advocates challenge these new restrictions under *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*? What other modes of advocacy are needed, in addition to litigation?

**SPEAKERS**

**Caitlin Borgmann**, Professor of Law, The City  
University of New York (CUNY) School of Law

**Khiara M. Bridges**, Associate Professor of Law,  
Boston University School of Law; Associate  
Professor of Anthropology, Boston University

**Kathleen Clyde**, State Representative, Ohio  
House of Representatives, 75th District

**Louise Melling**, Deputy Legal Director, ACLU;  
Director, ACLU Center for Liberty

**Julie Rikelman**, Litigation Director,  
Center for Reproductive Rights

\* ACS is a State Bar of California and State Bar of Illinois approved MCLE provider.

Friday, June 20 *continued*

12:30–2:00 p.m.

**Lunch**..... Presidential Ballroom

- ACS Lawyer Chapter Awards
- Presentation of 2014 Progressive Champion Award to Roderick A. Palmore

**Reflections on *Windsor***

Last year's watershed case of *United States v. Windsor* was one of the most highly-watched Supreme Court cases in decades, establishing new rights for millions of Americans and setting the stage for the scores of marriage equality battles that have swept the nation's courts. This luncheon plenary will feature three distinguished experts who were deeply involved in the groundbreaking *Windsor* litigation. What were their experiences in leading the case to victory at the Supreme

Court? What is the broader impact of *Windsor* on equality principles? And, what comes next?

**SPEAKERS**

**Mary L. Bonauto**, *Civil Rights Project Director, Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders (GLAD)*

**Roberta (Robbie) Kaplan**, *Partner, Paul, Weiss LLP*

**Pamela Karlan**, *Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice*

2:00–3:30 p.m.

**Plenary Panel**..... Presidential Ballroom**Beyond a Broken Beltway: State Courts, Legislatures and Cities as Venues for Progressive Change\***

State courts, legislatures and municipal governments are becoming increasingly important forums for achieving progressive change as obstruction in Congress and the Supreme Court's conservative majority make action difficult at the federal level. State courts play a vital role shaping the law on voting rights, criminal justice, environmental and human rights issues, and often have the last word on who votes and wins elections, goes to jail or faces the death penalty, drinks clean water and can get married. State legislatures and municipal governments also are leading the way in promoting economic equality via increases in the minimum wage and other innovative approaches. But the same forces blocking progress at the federal level also pose threats at the state and local level. Almost all state court judges stand for election, and after *Citizens United*, waves of special interest money have flooded into those elections, threatening the fairness and impartiality of state courts. The American Legislative Exchange Council controls a lavishly funded network of state legislators dedicated to turning back

the clock at the state and local level. This panel will examine opportunities and challenges presented by these efforts to achieve progress beyond the Beltway and how progressives can play an active role in the struggle.

**SPEAKERS**

**Dennis Herrera**, *City Attorney, San Francisco*

**Scott Lemieux**, *Professor of Political Science, The College of St. Rose*

**Nick Rathod**, *Executive Director, American Legislative and Issue Campaign Exchange (ALICE)*

**Thomas A. Saenz**, *President and General Counsel, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)*

**Joanna Shepherd-Bailey**, *Associate Professor of Law, Emory University School of Law*

**Jo-Ann Wallace**, *President and CEO, National Legal Aid & Defender Association (NLADA)*

**Maya Wiley**, *Counsel to the Mayor, City of New York*

Friday, June 20 *continued*

3:45–5:00 p.m.

## Breakout Sessions

**Voting Rights in the Post-Shelby County Era**..... *South American A/B Room*

Voting rights and election administration are receiving public attention at levels not seen since the Civil Rights Movement. In just the past few years, our Nation has seen a massive wave of new state laws making it harder to vote, a series of court decisions adjudicating the legality of these laws, the Supreme Court's devastating *Shelby County* decision, the introduction of legislation to amend the Voting Rights Act and sweeping recommendations by the Presidential Commission on Election Administration to improve how we run and manage elections. What is the status of our ability to protect against voter suppression a year after *Shelby County*? What new or different tools are being used in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision? Do we need new legal protections against voter suppression

and voting discrimination? Should restrictive voting laws be examined through a race-conscious framework, a party-conscious framework, or both?

## SPEAKERS

**Gilda Daniels**, Associate Professor, University of Baltimore School of Law

**Dale Ho**, Director, ACLU Voting Rights Project

**Samuel Issacharoff**, Reiss Professor of Constitutional Law, New York University School of Law

**Arturo Vargas**, Executive Director, National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO)

**Wendy R. Weiser**, Director, Democracy Program, Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law

**Executive Power in a Time of Political Dysfunction?**..... *Federal A Room*

In his 2014 State of the Union speech, President Obama declared: "... [W]herever and whenever I can take steps without legislation to expand opportunity for more American families, that's what I'm going to do." The scope of executive authority, whether in the face of congressional obstruction or presidential assertions of power, has been continually called into question in recent years. From the controversy over raising the debt limit to the Supreme Court's review of the President's recess appointment powers, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and decisions about foreign military intervention, these questions continue to surface and how they are answered will have tremendous impact on how our government does—

or does not—function. This panel will address the shifting nature of the executive-legislative relationship in a time of gridlock in Washington.

## SPEAKERS

**Steven G. Bradbury**, Partner, Dechert LLP

**Michael Gottlieb**, Partner, Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP

**Dahlia Lithwick**, Senior Editor, Slate

**Gillian Metzger**, Vice Dean and Stanley H. Fuld Professor of Law; Faculty Director, Center for Constitutional Governance, Columbia Law School

**Ronald Weich**, Dean, University of Baltimore School of Law

**The Web as the New Battleground over Free Expression\***..... *Federal B Room*

A free and open Internet has become one of history's most important "speech engines"—allowing anyone to use the megaphone of the Internet to express themselves. Scholars, activists, politicians and the general public utilize the Internet to stoke debate, challenge norms, rally constituents and change lives. Additionally, the emergence of digital democracy over the last decade has forced courts to revisit free expression principles in an entirely novel context and has prompted government actors to reevaluate their approaches to Internet regulation. What government and court actions might be considered a threat to free speech on the Internet, and when are limitations on free expression legitimate? How have these actions impacted the

development of technologies? Is there a progressive vision for free expression and the Internet?

## SPEAKERS

**Danielle Citron**, Professor of Law, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

**Garrett Epps**, Professor of Law, University of Baltimore School of Law

**Emma Llansó**, Director, Free Expression Project, Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT)

**Gabe Rottman**, Legislative Counsel and Policy Advisor, American Civil Liberties Union, Washington Legislative Office

**Tim Sparapani**, Vice President of Law, Policy and Government Relations, App Developers Alliance

\* ACS is a State Bar of California and State Bar of Illinois approved MCLE provider.

## Friday, June 20 *continued*

**3:45–5:00 p.m.**      **Breakout Sessions** *continued*

**Seeking an End to Racial Profiling** ..... *Senate Room*

In the past year, we have seen successful challenges to racial profiling under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, most recently in the New York City “stop and frisk” case *Floyd v. City of New York* and Arizona’s *Melendres v. Arpaio*. Yet prevailing constitutional interpretations allow profiling and biased policing to continue in domestic law enforcement, immigration, and national security. Advocates have called upon Congress to pass the “End Racial Profiling Act” and have asked the Department of Justice to review its guidance on the use of race by federal law enforcement, with the Department recently announcing that it will expand the prohibited categories used in profiling to include religion, national origin, gender and sexual orientation. This panel will consider whether recent executive, judicial and legislative actions suggest a positive shift away from racial profiling and police bias. Are new equal protection or

Fourth Amendment standards emerging? In what ways might popular mobilization or the actions of representative government make a difference in the ways courts interpret constitutional safeguards against profiling?

**SPEAKERS**

- Nicole Austin-Hillery**, *Director and Counsel, Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law*
- Devon Carbado**, *Honorable Harry Pregerson Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law*
- Keenan R. Keller**, *Senior Democratic Counsel, Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives*
- Sunita Patel**, *Staff Attorney, Center for Constitutional Rights*
- Alessandra Soler**, *Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona*

**5:15–6:45 p.m.**      **Plenary Panel** ..... *Presidential Ballroom*

**Judging Civil Legal Aid**

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), the nation’s largest funder of civil legal aid, and the need for legal services has peaked, with more than 61 million low-income Americans eligible for such assistance when facing crises like foreclosure and domestic violence. In addition to calls for increased funding, LSC and courts are creating commissions and taskforces to identify innovative solutions to meet the ever increasing demand. Proposed reforms include creating online pro bono portals and incentivizing law students to respond to unmet legal needs through clinics and fellowships. What other strategic responses to the legal services crisis are being advanced? Can we point to successful civil right-to-counsel or “Civil Gideon” efforts?

**SPEAKERS**

- Honorable Nathan L. Hecht**, *Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Texas*
  - Honorable Goodwin Liu**, *Associate Justice, California Supreme Court*
  - Honorable Chase T. Rogers**, *Chief Justice, Connecticut Supreme Court*
  - Honorable David S. Tatel**, *Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit*
  - Honorable Eric T. Washington**, *Chief Judge, District of Columbia Court of Appeals*
- Moderated by ACS President Caroline Fredrickson*

**6:45–8:00 p.m.**      **Reception** ..... *Congressional and Senate Rooms*

**8:00–10:00 p.m.**      **Convention Happy Hour** ..... *P.J. Clarke’s, 1600 K St, NW*  
*Sponsored by the D.C. Lawyer Chapter*

## Saturday, June 21

8:00–9:00 a.m.	<b>Faculty Advisor Breakfast</b> .....	Pan American Room
8:00–9:00 a.m.	<b>Next Generation Leaders Breakfast*</b> .....	Statler A/B Room
9:15–11:00 a.m.	<b>Plenary Panel</b> .....	Presidential Ballroom

**Shedding Light on the PRISM of Government\***

Recent revelations regarding the National Security Agency's surveillance programs have ignited a fierce national debate over core fundamental constitutional privacy principles that underpin American democracy. What is the impact of the NSA surveillance programs on democratic governance, and what do measures by the President and activity in the courts portend for the program, privacy rights and constitutional jurisprudence? How does the existence of these programs, along with post 9-11 detention and interrogation measures, covert targeted killings, and a surreptitious FISA court inform our national conversation regarding government accountability and transparency? This panel will explore these questions and whether it is truly possible to balance the government's interest in national security and the public's interest in privacy and transparency.

**SPEAKERS**

**Jamie S. Gorelick**, *Partner, WilmerHale*  
**Siobhan Gorman**, *Intelligence Correspondent, The Wall Street Journal*  
**Jameel Jaffer**, *Deputy Legal Director, ACLU Foundation; Director, ACLU Center for Democracy*  
**Neomi Rao**, *Associate Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law*  
**Peter Swire**, *Nancy J. and Lawrence P. Huang Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology, Scheller College of Business*  
**Stephen I. Vladeck**, *Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship, American University Washington College of Law*

**11:15 a.m.–12:45 p.m. Breakout Sessions****Your Day in Court? The Undermining of Access to Justice\***..... Congressional Room

A series of recent Supreme Court and circuit court decisions have made it more and more difficult for consumers, employees and investors to seek redress in court. Widespread use of mandatory arbitration clauses and new rules for class certification are impediments to relief for consumers. For employees, decisions like *Wal-Mart v. Dukes* mean that class actions, historically an avenue to address race and gender discrimination, are increasingly no longer available. And this Term, the Supreme Court's decision in *Halliburton* will shape the viability of investor class actions against companies for fraud. This panel will consider the current state of class action litigation and mandatory arbitration and explore strategies to protect access to the courts for everyone.

**SPEAKERS**

**John H. Beisner**, *Partner, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP*  
**F. Paul Bland, Jr.**, *Executive Director, Public Justice*  
**David M. Brodsky**, *Principal, Brodsky ADR LLC*  
**Elizabeth J. Cabraser**, *Partner, Loeff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP*  
**Myron M. Cherry**, *Founder and Managing Partner, Myron M. Cherry & Associates, LLC*  
**Eric L. Cramer**, *Managing Shareholder, Berger & Montague, P.C.*  
**Allan B. Diamond**, *Partner, Diamond McCarthy LLP*

**Judge Nancy Gertner**, *Judge (Ret.), U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts; Professor of Practice, Harvard Law School*  
**Fatima Goss Graves**, *Vice President for Education and Employment, National Women's Law Center*  
**Marc I. Gross**, *Managing Partner, Pomerantz LLP*  
**Deborah P. Kelly**, *Partner, Dickstein Shapiro LLP*  
**Adam T. Klein**, *Partner, Outten & Golden LLP*  
**Suzette Malveaux**, *Professor of Law and Former Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Columbus School of Law, The Catholic University of America*  
**Gregory A. Markel**, *Partner, Cadwalader*  
**Cyrus Mehri**, *Founding Partner, Mehri & Skalet, PLLC*  
**Arthur R. Miller**, *University Professor, New York University School of Law; Chairman, New York University Sports & Society Program*  
**Alan B. Morrison**, *Lerner Family Associate Dean for Public Interest and Public Service Law, The George Washington University Law School*  
**Scott A. Powell**, *Partner, Hare, Wynn, Newell & Newton*  
**Johnathan Smith**, *Assistant Counsel of the Economic Justice Group, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF)*  
**Harry P. Susman**, *Partner, Susman Godfrey LLP*

\* Invitation only; + ACS is a State Bar of California and State Bar of Illinois approved MCLE provider.

Saturday, June 21 *continued*11:15 a.m.–12:45 p.m. **Breakout Sessions** *continued***Is There a Better Way to Appoint Federal Judges?\*** ..... *South American A/B Room*

This year witnessed the complete meltdown of the federal judicial appointment process, with Republicans in the Senate continuing to obstruct President Obama’s judicial nominees at an unprecedented rate, and the Democratic response being to change the Senate rules so as to prevent regular filibusters. Debate is ongoing about the future of the blue slip practice, which affords home state senators the opportunity to prevent the consideration of nominees—nominees that in some cases they initially supported. What reforms can be adopted that would improve this process? Would implementing term limits instead of lifetime tenure on all federal judges, including the Supreme Court, help to diminish partisan rancor and obstruction?

**SPEAKERS**

**James Lindgren**, *Professor of Law, Northwestern University School of Law*  
**Honorable Theodore A. McKee**, *Chief Circuit Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit*  
**Alfreda Robinson**, *Associate Dean for Trial Advocacy, Professorial Lecturer in Law, and Co-Director of the Litigation and Dispute Resolution Program, George Washington University Law School*  
**Ryan W. Scott**, *Associate Professor, Maurer School of Law, Indiana University*  
**Russell R. Wheeler**, *Visiting Fellow, Governance Studies Program, Brookings Institution; President, Governance Institute; Adjunct Professor, American University Washington College of Law*

**Beyond Citizens United and McCutcheon: What Next for Campaign Finance Regulation?\*** ..... *Senate Room*

The Supreme Court’s *Citizens United* decision, now four years old, has remade the campaign finance landscape. Outside spending has soared, with outside entities and “dark money” exercising unprecedented influence over elections. Just a few months ago, in *McCutcheon v. FEC*, the Court went even further, invalidating the aggregate contribution limits on individual donors and endorsing an extremely narrow view of the type of corruption that can justify campaign finance regulation. Those who strive to provide a level playing field in U.S. elections face a hostile Supreme Court, which has taken aim both at strategies that seek to restrict the flow of big money and measures that provide grassroots candidates with additional resources to help them compete. Will the impact of *McCutcheon* be as significant as that of *Citizens United*? What can be done to move beyond

the current jurisprudence? What should be the constitutional principle that supports regulation of the use of money in politics? Do advocates of regulation need to move beyond the corruption frame, and if so, what should replace it?

**SPEAKERS**

**Thomas M. Hilbink**, *Senior Program Officer, U.S. Programs, Open Society Foundations*  
**Adam Lioz**, *Counsel, Demos*  
**Wendy Kaminer**, *Author, Lawyer, and Commentator*  
**Robert C. Post**, *Dean and Sol & Lillian Goldman Professor of Law, Yale Law School*  
**Ciara Torres-Spelliscy**, *Associate Professor, Stetson University College of Law*  
**Robert Weissman**, *President, Public Citizen*

\* ACS is a State Bar of California and State Bar of Illinois approved MCLE provider.



## Saturday, June 21 *continued*

**11:15 a.m.-12:45 p.m. Breakout Sessions *continued***

**Polluted Equality? The State of Environmental Justice\*** ..... *Federal A Room*

In 1994, President Bill Clinton signed an executive order to focus federal attention on the environmental and human health conditions of minority and low-income populations with the goal of achieving environmental protection for all communities, thus solidifying a legal framework for the growing environmental justice movement. Two decades later, in view of reports of many American urban centers facing depleted access to sources of clean water, stories of densely populated minority areas grappling with significant and disproportionately high air pollution, and evidence of fossil fuel mining changing the health of low income communities, has the environmental justice movement progressed? How is the environmental justice legal framework informed by equality principles guaranteed by the Constitution? And

what are the true impediments to the success of the environmental justice movement?

**SPEAKERS**

**Sue Briggum**, *Vice President, Federal Public Affairs, Waste Management*

**Shanna Cleveland**, *Senior Attorney, Conservation Law Foundation*

**Sharmila L. Murthy**, *Assistant Professor, Suffolk University Law School; Visiting Scholar, Harvard Kennedy School of Government*

**Daria Neal**, *Deputy Chief, Federal Coordination and Compliance Section, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice*

**Patrice Lumumba Simms**, *Associate Professor, Howard University School of Law*

**1:00-1:45 p.m. Networking Lunch** ..... *Presidential Ballroom*

- Presentation of Constance Baker Motley Writing Competition Award, Reproductive Rights and Justice Award (in conjunction with the Center for Reproductive Rights), ACS Student Chapter Awards, and Richard D. Cudahy Award

**6:00-8:00 p.m. Student Networking Dinners**

**7:00-9:30 p.m. ACS Night at the Theater** ..... *Ronald Reagan Building*

- Capitol Steps ..... *and International Trade Center  
1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW*