



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
STANDING COMMITTEE
on the FEDERAL JUDICIARY

WHAT IT IS *and* HOW IT WORKS

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
STANDING COMMITTEE
on the FEDERAL JUDICIARY

WHAT IT IS *and* HOW IT WORKS



American Bar Association

The Committee's webpage may be accessed at:
<http://www.abanet.org/scfedjud>

Cover Photo by Franz Jantzen
Collection of the Supreme Court of the United States

Copyright © 1977, 1980, 1983, 1988, 1991, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2009
American Bar Association

ISBN: 1-60442-461-3

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE

on the FEDERAL JUDICIARY

In 2009, the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary resumed its long-standing practice of providing the White House with the Committee's evaluation of the professional qualifications of each prospective nominee to the lower federal courts in advance of the President making a nomination. Every President from 1953 through 2000 has consulted with the Committee regarding prospective federal judicial nominations. From 2001 through 2008, the Committee conducted its evaluations after the President submitted the names of nominees to the U.S. Senate but prior to the confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Regardless of when its work is done, the Committee has always evaluated only the professional competence, integrity and judicial temperament of each nominee.

I. OVERVIEW

A | **Committee Composition**

The Committee consists of fifteen members—two members from the Ninth Circuit, one member from each of the other federal judicial circuits, and the Chair of the Committee. The President of the ABA appoints members for staggered three-year terms, and no member may serve more than two terms. Appointment to the Committee is based on a lawyer's possession of the highest professional stature and integrity, and members have varied professional experiences and backgrounds.

B | **Scope of the Evaluative Function**

The Committee evaluates the professional qualifications of: Article III nominees to the Supreme Court of the United States, United States circuit courts of appeals, United States district courts, and the Court of International Trade; and Article IV nominees to the territorial district courts for the Virgin Islands, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands. The Committee does not propose, recommend or endorse candidates for nomination to the federal judiciary, as doing so would compromise its independent evaluative function.

In conducting its evaluation of each prospective nominee, the Committee focuses strictly on professional qualifications: integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament. The Committee does not take into account a prospective nominee's philosophy, political affiliation or ideology. The Committee's objective is to provide impartial peer-review evaluations of the professional qualifications of prospective judicial nominees in order to assist the White House in assessing whether such individuals should be nominated to the federal judiciary. The Committee submits its final rating to the White House, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the U.S. Department of Justice to assist in the confirmation process. The Committee's performance of its historic role in the evaluation process helps ensure that the most qualified persons serve on the federal judiciary.

C | **Impartiality and Independence**

The impartiality and independence of the Committee and its procedures are essential to the effectiveness of its work. The ABA's Board of Governors, House of Delegates, and officers are not involved in any way in the work of the Committee. Furthermore, no disclosures regarding the Committee's

substantive work are made to ABA volunteers or staff, up to and including the President of the ABA. Its work is insulated from, and independent of, all other activities of the ABA and is not affected by ABA policies other than those stated herein.

To preserve the integrity and independence of the Committee, no member may be an officer of the ABA, member of the Board of Governors, or a candidate for such offices while serving on the Committee. To further ensure the impartiality of the Committee, as a condition of appointment, each member agrees not to seek or accept a federal judicial nomination while serving on the Committee and for at least one year thereafter.

In addition, for one year after a judge's investiture, if the member who conducted the evaluation of that judge enters an appearance in a case assigned to him or her, the member must disclose to opposing counsel and the Court that he/she conducted the evaluation on behalf of the Committee. This disclosure obligation applies only to the member, not to other attorneys in the member's firm.

Also, while serving on the Committee, each member agrees not to participate in, or contribute to, any federal election campaign or engage in any partisan political activity on the federal level. The prohibition on partisan federal political activity requires that a member, while on the Committee, not host any fund-raiser or publicly endorse a candidate for federal office.

In view of the confidence reposed in the Committee and the vital importance of the integrity and credibility of its processes, these constraints are strictly enforced.¹

D | Confidentiality

A cornerstone of the Committee's peer review process is confidentiality. The Committee strictly maintains the confidentiality of its internal evaluation materials and reports, which are not disclosed to anyone other than Committee members.

The Committee does not give consideration to comments made by anonymous sources, and such comments will not be relied upon by the Committee in its rating of a prospective nominee. Instead, all interviewees who wish to have their comments regarding a prospective nominee considered by the Committee must agree to the disclosure of their identity only to Committee members. The Committee maintains the strict confidentiality of the identity of all judges, lawyers and other individuals who provide information regarding the professional qualifications of a prospective nominee unless the interviewee has agreed to waive confidentiality. The assurance of confidentiality given to each interviewee by the Committee is essential to its ability to obtain candid assessments of a prospective nominee's professional qualifications.

The preservation of confidentiality is particularly critical with respect to the identity of individuals whom the President is considering nominating and whose names are provided to the Committee by the White House or the Department of Justice. Consistent with the procedures set forth in Section II(B), Committee members disclose the name of the prospective nominee only to those being interviewed about the nominee. Each interviewee is asked to keep the name of the prospective nominee and the substance of the interview strictly confidential. Even though the Committee makes every effort to conduct its evaluations in a confidential manner, it nevertheless is possible that the performance of an evaluation will result in identification of a prospective nominee by a member of the public, particularly in light of the fact that the names of prospective nominees are often the subject of media speculation even before the Committee is apprised of them.

After the evaluation of a prospective nominee is concluded but before a Committee vote is taken, the Chair contacts the White House to indicate the likely outcome of the Committee's evaluation. This information is maintained in the strictest of confi-

¹ The *Governing Principles of the Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary* are attached as Appendix I.

dence. If the Committee proceeds to vote on a rating for the prospective nominee, the rating is released only after the President publicly announces an intention to make a nomination or submits the nomination to the Senate.

The Committee adheres to principles of non-disclosure and strict confidentiality because the nomination process is a presidential function, and the President should be able to obtain a confidential assessment of the professional qualifications of prospective nominees. Moreover, prospective nominees not ultimately nominated should be spared any embarrassment that might result from disclosure of the evaluation.

II. NOMINATIONS TO FEDERAL COURTS OTHER THAN THE SUPREME COURT²

Under ordinary circumstances, the Committee evaluates prospective nominees for approximately 60 vacancies on the lower federal courts each year.

A | Evaluation Criteria

The Committee's evaluation of prospective nominees to the federal bench is directed solely to their professional qualifications: integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament.

When the Committee evaluates "integrity," it considers the prospective nominee's character and general reputation in the legal community, as well as the prospective nominee's industry and diligence.

"Professional competence" encompasses such qualities as intellectual capacity, judgment, writing and analytical abilities, knowledge of the law, and breadth of professional experience.

In evaluating "judicial temperament," the Committee considers the prospective nominee's compassion, decisiveness, open-mindedness, courtesy, patience, freedom from bias, and commitment to equal justice under the law.

The Committee believes that a prospective nominee to the federal bench ordinarily should have at least twelve years' experience in the practice of law. In evaluating the professional qualifications of a prospective nominee, the Committee recognizes that substantial courtroom and trial experience as a lawyer or trial judge is important. Distinguished accomplishments in the field of law or experience that is similar to in-court trial work—such as appearing before or serving on administrative agencies or arbitration boards, or teaching trial advocacy or other clinical law school courses—may compensate for a prospective nominee's lack of substantial courtroom experience. In addition, in evaluating a prospective nominee's professional experience, the Committee may take into consideration whether opportunities for advancement in the profession for women and members of minority groups were limited.

The Committee believes that prospective appellate court nominees should possess an especially high degree of legal scholarship, academic talent, analytical and writing abilities, and overall excellence. The ability to write clearly and persuasively, to harmonize a body of law, and to give meaningful guidance to the trial courts and the bar for future cases are particularly important skills for prospective nominees to the appellate courts. Because an appellate judge deals primarily with the review of briefs and the records of lower courts, the Committee places somewhat less emphasis on the importance of trial experience as a qualification for the appellate courts.

While the Committee recognizes that civic activities and public service are valuable experiences for a prospective nominee, they are not a substitute for significant experience in the practice of law in either the private or public sector.

² The Committee's procedures for evaluating prospective nominees to the Supreme Court are somewhat different from those for lower courts, and therefore are summarized separately.

B | Evaluation Procedures

After a judicial vacancy occurs and prior to any nomination to fill that vacancy, the Chair of the Committee receives from the White House or the Department of Justice the name of a prospective judicial nominee for evaluation.

The evaluation of a prospective nominee is usually assigned to a current member of the Committee from the judicial circuit in which the judicial vacancy exists.³ If the current Committee member is unavailable for any reason, the evaluation is performed by a current Committee member from a different circuit or a former Committee member.

The Department of Justice sends to each prospective nominee a comprehensive questionnaire (“Personal Data Questionnaire” or “PDQ”)⁴ that seeks wide-ranging information related to a prospective nominee’s fitness for judicial service, and a waiver form to permit disciplinary records to be checked. The prospective nominee returns the completed questionnaire and signed waiver form to the Department of Justice, which then forwards both documents to the Chair of the Committee. The Chair forwards the PDQ and waiver to the evaluator and Committee members.

The evaluator’s receipt from the Chair of the prospective nominee’s PDQ and the signed waiver form marks the starting point for the evaluation process. The evaluator makes extensive use of the prospective nominee’s responses to the PDQ in the evaluation process; consequently, the prompt submission of thorough and accurate responses to the questionnaire is extremely important to the timeliness of the evaluation.

The evaluator examines the legal writings of the prospective nominee, conducts research about the prospective nominee, and identifies and reviews reported and unreported court decisions, briefs, legal memoranda, publications, speeches, hearing and argument transcripts, articles, and other writ-

ings by or involving the prospective nominee. The evaluator utilizes the prospective nominee’s signed waiver form to obtain information regarding any disciplinary actions or proceedings involving the prospective nominee.

The evaluator also conducts extensive confidential interviews of a broad cross-section of judges, lawyers and others to obtain their assessments of the prospective nominee’s integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament, and the underlying bases for such opinions. The evaluator seeks to interview persons identified in the prospective nominee’s responses to the PDQ; federal, state and administrative judges before whom the prospective nominee has appeared; lawyers who have been co-counsel or opposing counsel in cases handled by the prospective nominee; and, if the prospective nominee is a former or sitting judge, other judges who have served with the prospective nominee.

In addition, interviews may be conducted of law school professors and deans; legal services and public interest lawyers; representatives of professional legal organizations; and community leaders and others who have information concerning the prospective nominee’s professional qualifications. Comments from groups involved in the recommendation of prospective nominees for the federal judiciary may be received. The evaluator will conduct any interviews or follow-up inquiries deemed to be warranted after receipt of such materials.

Every evaluation includes a personal interview of the prospective nominee by the evaluator, usually conducted at the prospective nominee’s office. The interview, attended only by the evaluator and prospective nominee, takes place near the end of the evaluation after most of the interviews with lawyers, judges and community members have been completed.

While confidentiality is the linchpin of the Committee’s evaluation process, the Committee strives at the same time to be fair to the prospective nominee

³ The Committee member conducting the evaluation hereinafter is referred to as the “evaluator.”

⁴ The PDQ which was approved for use by the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee in 2009 is attached as Appendix II.

with respect to adverse comments that are received during the course of the evaluation. If adverse comments are made about the prospective nominee, the evaluator will disclose to the prospective nominee during the personal interview as much of the underlying basis and context of the adverse comments as reasonably possible, consistent with the promise of confidentiality made to interviewees. Also, the evaluator will discuss with the prospective nominee any adverse comments that are a matter of public record or otherwise already known by the prospective nominee. If an adverse comment about the prospective nominee is made by someone who has not waived confidentiality, and if disclosure of the substance of that adverse comment to the prospective nominee would necessarily compromise the promise of confidentiality given to the source of the comment, it will not be reported by the evaluator to the prospective nominee and it will not be revealed to, or considered by, the Committee in its evaluation and rating of the prospective nominee.

During the personal interview, the prospective nominee will be afforded a full opportunity to address and rebut any adverse information or comments disclosed by the evaluator, and to respond to any disciplinary issues. If the prospective nominee identifies persons or provides documents or other information that can shed additional light on the adverse comments or the prospective nominee's professional qualifications, the evaluator will conduct appropriate follow-up interviews and such further investigation as may be deemed necessary.

If information concerning the health of the prospective nominee that bears on professional qualifications is obtained during the evaluation and taken into consideration, the prospective nominee will be afforded the opportunity to address any concerns in this regard as well.

In certain circumstances, one or more current or former members of the Committee may be assigned to an evaluation. For example, if the

prospective nominee's career has extended geographically over more than one circuit, it is customary to ask the Committee member in each such circuit to conduct the interviews in his or her own circuit. In these situations, all information is exchanged among the evaluators.

At the conclusion of an evaluation, a written Informal Report is prepared by the evaluator for review by the Chair. The Informal Report sets forth a description of the prospective nominee's background; the identity of each interviewee and a summary of each interview; a summary of the interview with the prospective nominee, including the prospective nominee's response to any adverse information or comments disclosed by the evaluator; an evaluation of the prospective nominee's professional qualifications; and a recommended rating. In addition, the evaluator includes the prospective nominee's PDQ and copies of other relevant materials, including writing samples, significant cases, and articles by or about the prospective nominee. Materials pertaining to any prior evaluations of the prospective nominee performed by the Committee also are included.

The evaluator submits the Informal Report to the Chair, who reviews it for thoroughness and completeness by checking, among other things, that all disciplinary agencies have been contacted, a requisite number of interviews of individuals with diverse backgrounds has been conducted, sufficient writing samples have been reviewed by the evaluator, the prospective nominee has had the opportunity to address and rebut any adverse information, and a thorough explanation has been given for the recommended rating.

After discussing the Informal Report with the evaluator, and before a final vote is taken, the Chair contacts the White House to indicate the likely outcome of the evaluation. The Chair does not provide the Informal Report to the White House, Department of Justice, Senate Judiciary

Committee, or any person outside the Committee, and does not disclose the identities of those interviewed by the evaluator.

If the White House requests the Committee to provide its rating for the prospective nominee, the Chair directs the evaluator to prepare a Formal Report.⁵ The evaluator then sends the Formal Report, PDQ, and copies of other relevant materials considered by the evaluator and previously included in the Informal Report to each Committee member unless a member has been recused from the evaluation.

If a Committee member has any questions concerning the Final Report and the accompanying materials, those questions are discussed with the evaluator or Chair.

C | Votes and Ratings of the Committee

Each member independently reviews the Final Report and its enclosures and independently votes on the rating to be given to the prospective nominee.

There are three possible ratings that a prospective nominee may receive from the Committee: “Well Qualified,” “Qualified,” and “Not Qualified.”

To merit a rating of “Well Qualified,” the prospective nominee must be at the top of the legal profession in his or her legal community; have outstanding legal ability, breadth of experience, and the highest reputation for integrity; and demonstrate the capacity for sound judicial temperament.

The rating of “Qualified” means that the prospective nominee satisfies the Committee’s very high standards with respect to integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament, and that the Committee believes that the prospective nominee is qualified to perform satisfactorily all of the duties and responsibilities required of a federal judge.

When a prospective nominee is found “Not Qualified,” the Committee has determined that the prospective nominee does not meet the Committee’s

standards with respect to one or more of its evaluation criteria—integrity, professional competence or judicial temperament.

The Chair does not vote on the rating to be given to a prospective nominee, except in the rare instance of a tie vote among the rest of the Committee. If a former Committee member has conducted the evaluation, that former Committee member does not participate in the Committee’s vote on the rating to be given to the prospective nominee.

Each member of the Committee independently conveys his or her vote to the Chair. Once all votes are tallied, the Chair confidentially advises the White House of the Committee’s rating. If the Committee has been unanimous in its rating, the Chair so states. Otherwise, the Chair discloses that the prospective nominee received a certain rating from either a majority (8-9 members) or substantial majority (10-13 members) of the Committee and notes that a minority gave the prospective nominee another rating or ratings. The majority rating represents the Committee’s official rating of the prospective nominee.

D | Appointment of Second Evaluator if There May Be a “Not Qualified” Rating

In any instance in which an evaluator appraises the Chair that the evaluator will recommend that a prospective nominee be rated “Not Qualified,” the Chair will apprise the White House that it appears that a prospective nominee may receive a “Not Qualified” rating. The Chair also appraises the White House that as a matter of fairness to the prospective nominee a second evaluator will be appointed. The White House can inform the Chair to cease the rating process and not appoint a second evaluator.

Thereafter, if the White House advises the Committee to proceed with its evaluation of the prospective nominee, the Chair will appoint a second evaluator to conduct an independent review of the

⁵ An outline of the final Formal Report prepared by the evaluator and distributed only to Committee members is attached as Appendix III.

prospective nominee's professional qualifications. In such instances, the Informal Report by the first evaluator will not be distributed by the Chair to other Committee members until the second evaluator has completed his or her own evaluation and Informal Report.

The second evaluator, who is either a current or former Committee member, performs a cross-check of the thoroughness of the evaluation conducted by the first evaluator. In addition, after a careful and independent review of the materials and information prepared by the first evaluator, as well as the prospective nominee's responses to the PDQ and legal writings, the second evaluator conducts whatever additional interviews or follow-up inquiries he or she deems warranted. The second evaluator also conducts a new interview of the prospective nominee in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section II(B). The second evaluator prepares an Informal Report setting forth the identity of each interviewee and a summary of the interviews conducted; a summary of the interview with the prospective nominee; and his or her own recommended rating for the prospective nominee.

After reviewing the Informal Reports prepared by the first and second evaluators, the Chair directs the evaluators to prepare separate Formal Reports and to send them simultaneously to the Committee members. Each Committee member (except any member who has been recused from the evaluation) will independently review these Formal Reports and the enclosures and advise the Chair of his or her own vote concerning the rating to be given to the nominee. Without divulging any confidential information, the Chair will advise the White House of the Committee's tentative rating of the prospective nominee.

If the prospective nominee is subsequently nominated by the President, the previously tentative rating by the Committee will become the

Committee's final rating of the nominee. If the prospective nominee is not nominated, the tentative rating is not publicly released.

E | Nomination by the President

If the President nominates the prospective nominee, the Chair notifies the White House, the U.S. Department of Justice, each member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the nominee in writing of the Committee's rating, which also is posted on the Committee's website for the public record. Prior to the nomination by the President or the White House's announcement of the President's intention to nominate, the Committee's rating of a prospective nominee is not public.

F | Recusal and Abstention

No Committee member, including the Chair, shall participate in the evaluation or vote on the rating of a prospective nominee in any instance in which such participation would give rise to the appearance of impropriety or would otherwise be incompatible with the purposes served and functions performed by the Committee, or where such member's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Any Committee member whose partner, associate or relative is a prospective nominee or who knows of any other disqualifying reason shall immediately recuse himself or herself from the evaluation and voting. A Committee member shall not participate in an evaluation of a sitting judge before whom the member has a pending case. This proscription ordinarily does not apply when other lawyers of the Committee member's firm have pending cases before the prospective judge-nominee, although recusal also may be appropriate in such a situation.

In the event of recusal by the Chair, the Chair will seek his or her replacement for that particular evaluation by soliciting the service of a former

Chair. If a former Chair is not available to oversee the evaluation in a timely fashion, the current Chair will ask a current or former member to serve as Chair for the evaluation in question. In such circumstances, the temporary Chair does not vote on the rating to be given to the prospective nominee.

A recused member will not have access to the Final Report on the prospective nominee in question and will not vote on the rating for the prospective nominee.

In rare instances, a Committee member may abstain from participating in a vote on a prospective nominee because, for example, sickness or an extended trial or professional commitment has prevented the member from fully considering the Final Report and evaluating the prospective nominee's professional qualifications.

G | Submission of Written Statement and Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee

In instances where a nominee has been rated "Not Qualified" by the Committee and a hearing on the nomination is scheduled by the Senate Judiciary Committee at which the Committee is asked to testify, a written statement is prepared and submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee explaining the reasons for the Committee's rating. In order to preserve the confidentiality previously promised to interviewees, the statement does not identify the persons who provided information received by the Committee.

The written statement is submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the nominee 48 hours in advance of the nominee's scheduled confirmation hearing if the Committee has at least seven days' advance notice of the hearing date and is assured that the statement will not be disseminated publicly until the day of the hearing. Otherwise, the Committee submits its written statement 24 hours in advance of the nominee's confirmation hearing.

The Chair and the evaluators who conducted the first and second evaluations of the prospective nominee usually appear to testify at the nominee's confirmation hearing at the request of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

H | Supplemental Evaluations

The Committee will conduct a supplemental evaluation of nominees whose nominations have been returned by Congress or withdrawn, and then subsequently re-submitted by the President. However, a supplemental evaluation may not be performed if there is insufficient time for the Committee to complete it.

The extent and scope of the supplemental evaluation will be determined by the length of time since the most recent evaluation and rating by the Committee and whether there have been any new developments of a material nature bearing on the nominee's professional qualifications since that date. The supplemental evaluation will be conducted by a current or former member of the Committee, who will have access to the materials pertaining to any prior evaluation(s) of the nominee. In general, the supplemental evaluation will focus on any new information of a material nature that has been adduced since the Committee's most recent evaluation and rating of the nominee. However, the Chair may request that the evaluator seek additional information relating to the time period before the most recent evaluation if necessary to ensure that the Committee has a full and complete record of the nominee's professional qualifications.

The evaluator will prepare a Supplemental Report that will be forwarded to Committee members after first being reviewed by the Chair as set forth above in Section II(B). In addition, all materials pertaining to any prior evaluation(s) of the nominee performed by the Committee will be furnished to Committee members for their consideration. A rating on the nominee will be issued by

the Committee after the supplemental evaluation is completed, and that rating will supersede any prior rating of the nominee in connection with the earlier nomination(s).

III. NOMINATIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT

It is extremely important to the Committee's meaningful evaluation of Supreme Court nominees that the Committee has sufficient time to evaluate the nominees in depth. The procedures described below enable the Committee to provide assistance to the Senate in the confirmation process.

A | Evaluation Criteria

As with nominations to the lower courts, the Committee's evaluation of nominees to the Supreme Court is directed solely to their professional qualifications: integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament.⁶ The Committee does not take into account the nominee's philosophy, political affiliation or ideology. While the Committee utilizes the same evaluation criteria for Supreme Court nominees as for nominees to the other federal courts, the Committee's evaluation of a Supreme Court nominee is based on the premise that a Justice must possess exceptional professional qualifications.

A Supreme Court nominee should possess an especially high degree of legal scholarship, academic talent, analytical and writing abilities, and overall excellence. The ability to write clearly and persuasively, to harmonize a body of law, and to give meaningful guidance to the trial and circuit courts and the bar for future cases are particularly important skills for a Supreme Court nominee. The significance, range and complexity of the is-

ssues considered by the Justices, as well as the finality and nation-wide impact of the Supreme Court's decisions, are among the factors that require exceptional ability.

B | Evaluation Procedures

While the evaluation of a Supreme Court nominee is primarily conducted by the current Committee member(s) from the circuit where the nominee has practiced or served as a judge, all members of the Committee participate in the evaluation. Interviews are conducted nationwide of those persons likely to have information regarding the integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament of the Supreme Court nominee. Those interviewed include, where appropriate, federal and state judges, practicing lawyers in both private practice and government service, law school professors and deans, legal services and public interest lawyers, representatives of professional legal organizations, community and national leaders, and others who are in a position to evaluate the prospective nominee's integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament.

Teams of law school professors examine the legal writings (opinions, briefs, speeches, books, blogs, and articles) of the nominee. Customarily, this task is accomplished by dividing the writings into areas of the law and having the writings reviewed by professors who are recognized experts in each field or subject on which the nominee has written. The law school teams are usually under the direction of a dean or senior professor. A separate team of distinguished practicing lawyers, some of whom may be former Supreme Court law clerks or practice before the Supreme Court, also examines the legal writings of the nominee. Each team submits to the primary evaluators responsible for conducting the evaluation a summary of the findings for separate inclusion in the evaluators' Formal Report to the Committee.

⁶ See Section II(B) for an explanation of the applicable evaluation criteria.

An interview of the nominee is conducted by the evaluators and the Chair also may participate. The interview is conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section II(B).

The evaluators prepare a Formal Report containing a description of the nominee’s background; summaries of all interviews conducted, including the interview with the nominee; the summaries prepared by the law school teams and practitioner teams; an analysis of the nominee’s legal writings; an evaluation of the nominee’s professional qualifications; and a recommended rating.

In addition, all materials pertaining to any prior evaluations of the nominee performed by the Committee are furnished to Committee members for their review prior to any vote on the rating to be given to the nominee. The same recusal and abstention procedures set forth in Section II(F) apply to evaluations of Supreme Court nominees, and voting by the Committee is conducted in the same manner set forth in Section II(C).

C | Ratings

To merit the Committee’s rating of “Well Qualified,” a Supreme Court nominee must be a pre-eminent member of the legal profession, have outstanding legal ability and exceptional breadth of experience, and meet the very highest standards of integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament. The rating of “Well Qualified” is reserved for those found to merit the Committee’s strongest affirmative endorsement.

The rating of “Qualified” means that the nominee satisfies the Committee’s high standards with respect to integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament, and that the Committee believes the nominee is qualified to perform satisfactorily all of the duties and responsibilities required of the distinguished office of a Supreme Court Justice.

When a nominee is rated “Not Qualified,” the Committee has determined that the nominee does not meet the Committee’s high standards with respect to one or more of its evaluation criteria—integrity, professional competence or judicial temperament.

The Chair, in a letter, reports the Committee’s rating of the Supreme Court nominee to the White House, the U.S. Department of Justice, each member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the nominee. The rating also is posted on the Committee’s website for the public record.

The Committee prepares a written statement for submission to the Senate Judiciary Committee explaining the reasons for the Committee’s rating. In order to preserve the confidentiality promised to interviewees, the statement does not identify the person who provided information received by the Committee unless the person who gave such information waives confidentiality.

The Chair and the evaluator(s) primarily responsible for conducting the evaluation traditionally testify at the nominee’s confirmation hearing at the request of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Committee may submit a follow-up report to the Senate Judiciary Committee or to the Senate as a whole if new information is developed during the course of the hearing that warrants further evaluation by the Committee.

IV. RE-OPENING OF AN EVALUATION AFTER SUBMISSION OF A RATING

The Committee reserves the right to re-open an evaluation any time prior to the confirmation of a prospective nominee or nominee if new information of a material nature develops that the

Chair reasonably believes warrants additional investigation and re-examination of the prior rating rendered by the Committee. If an evaluation is reopened, the evaluator will follow up promptly on the new information; conduct any interviews considered necessary, including possibly re-interviewing the nominee; and prepare a new Report and recommended rating of the nominee in accordance with the procedures set forth above in Section II (B). Each Committee member will consider the new Report and then vote on the rating of the nominee. If the rating differs from the prior rating, the prior rating shall be deemed superseded.

V. CONCLUSION

As it has for over five decades, the ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary continues to offer its comprehensive peer-review evaluations of Article III and Article IV prospective judicial nominees and nominees as a service to the executive and legislative branches of our government and to the public. We believe that these peer-review evaluations have helped to maintain and enhance the high quality of the federal judiciary.

The Committee constantly seeks to learn from its experiences and to refine and improve its practices and procedures. To this end, the Committee welcomes suggestions from members of the bar and the public.

APPENDIX I

GOVERNING PRINCIPLES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

The Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary shall evaluate the professional qualifications of persons nominated to the federal bench on the basis of predetermined and objective evaluation criteria. The Committee will provide the White House, the U.S. Department of Justice and Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee its peer review evaluations of the professional competence, integrity and judicial temperament of such persons.

In view of the special nature of the function performed by this Committee and the confidence reposed in the Committee's evaluations, the integrity and credibility of its processes and the perception of these processes are of vital importance.

No member of the Committee, while serving as a member or within one year following such service, shall seek or accept a nomination to the federal bench.

No member of the Committee, including the Chair, shall participate in the evaluation or vote on the rating of a nominee in any instance in which such participation would give rise to the appearance of impropriety or would otherwise be incompatible with the purposes served and functions performed by the Committee, or where such member's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Because confidentiality and discretion are of critical importance to the evaluation processes of the Committee, only the President of the Association, the President's designee, or the Chair of the Committee shall respond to media or general public inquiries or make any statements to the media or general public relating to the work of the Committee.

The President of the Association shall take any action necessary to ensure adherence to these principles.

ADOPTED BY ABA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
REVISED: FEBRUARY 2007

APPENDIX II

PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE (AS OF MARCH 2009)

UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDICIAL NOMINEES

PUBLIC

1. NAME:

State full name (include any former names used).

2. POSITION:

State the position for which you have been nominated.

3. ADDRESS:

List current office address. If city and state of residence differs from your place of employment, please list the city and state where you currently reside.

4. BIRTHPLACE:

State date and place of birth.

5. EDUCATION:

List in reverse chronological order each college, law school, or any other institution of higher education attended and indicate for each the dates of attendance, whether a degree was received, and the date each degree was received.

APPENDIX II

6. EMPLOYMENT RECORD:

List in reverse chronological order all governmental agencies, business or professional corporations, companies, firms, or other enterprises, partnerships, institutions or organizations, non-profit or otherwise, with which you have been affiliated as an officer, director, partner, proprietor, or employee since graduation from college, whether or not you received payment for your services. Include the name and address of the employer and job title or description.

7. MILITARY SERVICE AND DRAFT STATUS:

Identify any service in the U.S. Military, including dates of service, branch of service, rank or rate, serial number (if different from social security number) and type of discharge received, and whether you have registered for selective service.

8. HONORS AND AWARDS:

List any scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, academic or professional honors, honorary society memberships, military awards, and any other special recognition for outstanding service or achievement.

9. BAR ASSOCIATIONS:

List all bar associations or legal or judicial-related committees, selection panels or conferences of which you are or have been a member, and give the titles and dates of any offices which you have held in such groups.

10. BAR AND COURT ADMISSION:

- a. List the date(s) you were admitted to the bar of any state and any lapses in membership. Please explain the reason for any lapse in membership.
- b. List all courts in which you have been admitted to practice, including dates of admission and any lapses in membership. Please explain the reason for any lapse in membership. Give the same information for administrative bodies that require special admission to practice.

APPENDIX II

11. MEMBERSHIPS:

- a. List all professional, business, fraternal, scholarly, civic, charitable, or other organizations, other than those listed in response to Questions 9 or 10 to which you belong, or to which you have belonged, since graduation from law school. Provide dates of membership or participation, and indicate any office you held. Include clubs, working groups, advisory or editorial boards, panels, committees, conferences, or publications.
- b. The American Bar Association's Commentary to its Code of Judicial Conduct states that it is inappropriate for a judge to hold membership in any organization that invidiously discriminates on the basis of race, sex, or religion, or national origin. Indicate whether any of these organizations listed in response to 11a above currently discriminate or formerly discriminated on the basis of race, sex, religion or national origin either through formal membership requirements or the practical implementation of membership policies. If so, describe any action you have taken to change these policies and practices.

12. PUBLISHED WRITINGS AND PUBLIC STATEMENTS:

- a. List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, letters to the editor, editorial pieces, or other published material you have written or edited, including material published only on the Internet. Supply four (4) copies of all published material to the Committee.
- b. Supply four (4) copies of any reports, memoranda or policy statements you prepared or contributed in the preparation of on behalf of any bar association, committee, conference, or organization of which you were or are a member. If you do not have a copy of a report, memorandum or policy statement, give the name and address of the organization that issued it, the date of the document, and a summary of its subject matter.
- c. Supply four (4) copies of any testimony, official statements or other communications relating, in whole or in part, to matters of public policy or legal interpretation, that you have issued or provided or that others presented on your behalf to public bodies or public officials.
- d. Supply four (4) copies, transcripts or recordings of all speeches or talks delivered by you, including commencement speeches, remarks, lectures, panel discussions, conferences, political speeches, and question-and-answer sessions. Include the date and place where they were delivered, and readily available press reports about the speech or talk. If you do not have a copy of the speech or a transcript or recording of your remarks, give the name and address of the group before whom the speech was given, the date of the speech, and a summary of its subject matter. If you did not speak from a prepared text, furnish a copy of any outline or notes from which you spoke.

APPENDIX II

- e. List all interviews you have given to newspapers, magazines or other publications, or radio or television stations, providing the dates of these interviews and four (4) copies of the clips or transcripts of these interviews where they are available to you.

13. JUDICIAL OFFICE:

State (chronologically) any judicial offices you have held, including positions as an administrative law judge, whether such position was elected or appointed, and a description of the jurisdiction of each such court.

- a. Approximately how many cases have you presided over that have gone to verdict or judgment? _____
 - i. Of these, approximately what percent were:
 - jury trials? _____%; bench trials _____% [total 100%]
 - civil proceedings? _____%; criminal proceedings? _____% [total 100%]
- b. Provide citations for all opinions you have written, including concurrences and dissents.
- c. For each of the 10 most significant cases over which you presided, provide: (1) a capsule summary of the nature the case; (2) the outcome of the case; (3) the name and contact information for counsel who had a significant role in the trial of the case; and (3) the citation of the case (if reported) or the docket number and a copy of the opinion or judgment (if not reported).
- d. For each of the 10 most significant opinions you have written, provide: (1) citations for those decisions that were published; (2) a copy of those decisions that were not published; and (3) the names and contact information for the attorneys who played a significant role in the case.
- e. Provide a list of all cases in which certiorari was requested or granted.
- f. Provide a brief summary of and citations for all of your opinions where your decisions were reversed by a reviewing court or where your judgment was affirmed with significant criticism of your substantive or procedural rulings. If any of the opinions listed were not officially reported, provide copies of the opinions.
- g. Provide a description of the number and percentage of your decisions in which you issued an unpublished opinion and the manner in which those unpublished opinions are filed and/or stored.

APPENDIX II

- h. Provide citations for significant opinions on federal or state constitutional issues, together with the citation to appellate court rulings on such opinions. If any of the opinions listed were not officially reported, provide copies of the opinions.
- i. Provide citations to all cases in which you sat by designation on a federal court of appeals, including a brief summary of any opinions you authored, whether majority, dissenting, or concurring, and any dissenting opinions you joined.

14. RECUSAL:

If you are or have been a judge, identify the basis by which you have assessed the necessity or propriety of recusal (If your court employs an “automatic” recusal system by which you may be recused without your knowledge, please include a general description of that system.) Provide a list of any cases, motions or matters that have come before you in which a litigant or party has requested that you recuse yourself due to an asserted conflict of interest or in which you have recused yourself sua sponte. Identify each such case, and for each provide the following information:

- a. whether your recusal was requested by a motion or other suggestion by a litigant or a party to the proceeding or by any other person or interested party; or if you recused yourself sua sponte;
- b. a brief description of the asserted conflict of interest or other ground for recusal;
- c. the procedure you followed in determining whether or not to recuse yourself;
- d. your reason for recusing or declining to recuse yourself, including any action taken to remove the real, apparent or asserted conflict of interest or to cure any other ground for recusal.

15. PUBLIC OFFICE, POLITICAL ACTIVITIES AND AFFILIATIONS:

- a. List chronologically any public offices you have held, other than judicial offices, including the terms of service and whether such positions were elected or appointed. If appointed, please include the name of the individual who appointed you. Also, state chronologically any unsuccessful candidacies you have had for elective office or unsuccessful nominations for appointed office.
- b. List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered, whether compensated or not, to any political party or election committee. If you have ever held a position or played a role in a political campaign, identify the particulars of the campaign, including the candidate, dates of the campaign, your title and responsibilities.

APPENDIX II

16. LEGAL CAREER:

Answer each part separately.

- a. Describe chronologically your law practice and legal experience after graduation from law school including:
 - i. whether you served as clerk to a judge, and if so, the name of the judge, the court and the dates of the period you were a clerk;
 - ii. whether you practiced alone, and if so, the addresses and dates;
 - iii. the dates, names and addresses of law firms or offices, companies or governmental agencies with which you have been affiliated, and the nature of your affiliation with each.
 - iv. whether you served as a mediator or arbitrator in alternative dispute resolution proceedings and, if so, a description of the 10 most significant matters with which you were involved in that capacity.
- b. Describe:
 - i. the general character of your law practice and indicate by date when its character has changed over the years.
 - ii. your typical clients and the areas at each period of your legal career, if any, in which you have specialized.
- c. Describe the percentage of your practice that has been in litigation and whether you appeared in court frequently, occasionally, or not at all. If the frequency of your appearances in court varied, describe such variance, providing dates.
 - i. Indicate the percentage of your practice in:
 1. federal courts;
 2. state courts of record;
 3. other courts;
 4. administrative agencies
 - ii. Indicate the percentage of your practice in:
 1. civil proceedings;
 2. criminal proceedings.

APPENDIX II

- d. State the number of cases in courts of record, including cases before administrative law judges, you tried to verdict, judgment or final decision (rather than settled), indicating whether you were sole counsel, chief counsel, or associate counsel.
 - i. What percentage of these trials were:
 - 1. jury;
 - 2. non-jury.
- e. Describe your practice, if any, before the Supreme Court of the United States. Supply four (4) copies of any briefs, amicus or otherwise, and, if applicable, any oral argument transcripts before the Supreme Court in connection with your practice.

17. LITIGATION:

Describe the ten (10) most significant litigated matters which you personally handled, whether or not you were the attorney of record. Give the citations, if the cases were reported, and the docket number and date if unreported. Give a capsule summary of the substance of each case. Identify the party or parties whom you represented; describe in detail the nature of your participation in the litigation and the final disposition of the case. Also state as to each case:

- a. the date of representation;
- b. the name of the court and the name of the judge or judges before whom the case was litigated; and
- c. the individual name, addresses, and telephone numbers of co-counsel and of principal counsel for each of the other parties.

18. LEGAL ACTIVITIES:

Describe the most significant legal activities you have pursued, including significant litigation which did not progress to trial or legal matters that did not involve litigation. Describe fully the nature of your participation in these activities. List any client(s) or organization(s) for whom you performed lobbying activities and describe the lobbying activities you performed on behalf of such client(s) or organizations(s). (Note: As to any facts requested in this question, please omit any information protected by the attorney-client privilege.)

APPENDIX II

19. TEACHING:

What courses have you taught? For each course, state the title, the institution at which you taught the course, the years in which you taught the course, and describe briefly the subject matter of the course and the major topics taught. If you have a syllabus of each course, provide four (4) copies to the committee.

20. DEFERRED INCOME/ FUTURE BENEFITS:

List the sources, amounts and dates of all anticipated receipts from deferred income arrangements, stock, options, uncompleted contracts and other future benefits which you expect to derive from previous business relationships, professional services, firm memberships, former employers, clients or customers. Describe the arrangements you have made to be compensated in the future for any financial or business interest.

21. OUTSIDE COMMITMENTS DURING COURT SERVICE:

Do you have any plans, commitments, or agreements to pursue outside employment, with or without compensation, during your service with the court? If so, explain.

22. SOURCES OF INCOME:

List sources and amounts of all income received during the calendar year preceding your nomination and for the current calendar year, including all salaries, fees, dividends, interest, gifts, rents, royalties, licensing fees, honoraria, and other items exceeding \$500 or more (if you prefer to do so, copies of the financial disclosure report, required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, may be substituted here).

23. STATEMENT OF NET WORTH:

Please complete the attached financial net worth statement in detail (add schedules as called for).

24. POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

- a. Identify the family members or other persons, parties, categories of litigation, and financial arrangements that are likely to present potential conflicts-of-interest when you first assume the position to which you have been nominated. Explain how you would address any such conflict if it were to arise.
- b. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest, including the procedure you will follow in determining these areas of concern.

APPENDIX II

25. PRO BONO WORK:

An ethical consideration under Canon 2 of the American Bar Association's Code of Professional Responsibility calls for "every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional workload, to find some time to participate in serving the disadvantaged." Describe what you have done to fulfill these responsibilities, listing specific instances and the amount of time devoted to each.

26. SELECTION PROCESS:

- a. Please describe your experience in the entire judicial selection process, from beginning to end (including the circumstances which led to your nomination and the interviews in which you participated). Is there a selection commission in your jurisdiction to recommend candidates for nomination to the federal courts? If so, please include that process in your description, as well as whether the commission recommended your nomination. List the dates of all interviews or communications you had with the White House staff or the Justice Department regarding this nomination. Do not include any contacts with Federal Bureau of Investigation personnel concerning your nomination.
- b. Has anyone involved in the process of selecting you as a judicial nominee discussed with you any currently pending or specific case, legal issue or question in a manner that could reasonably be interpreted as seeking any express or implied assurances concerning your position on such case, issue, or question? If so, explain fully.

APPENDIX II

FINANCIAL STATEMENT NET WORTH

Provide a complete, current financial net worth statement which itemizes in detail all assets (including bank accounts, real estate, securities, trusts, investments, and other financial holdings) all liabilities (including debts, mortgages, loans, and other financial obligations) of yourself, your spouse, and other immediate members of your household.

ASSETS				LIABILITIES			
Cash on hand and in banks				Notes payable to banks - secured			
U.S. Government securities - add schedule				Notes payable to banks - unsecured			
Listed securities - add schedule				Notes payable to relatives			
Unlisted securities - add schedule				Notes payable to others			
Accounts and notes receivable				Accounts and bills due			
Due from relatives and friends				Unpaid income tax			
Due from others				Other unpaid income and interest			
Doubtful				Real estate mortgages payable - add schedule			
Real estate owned - add schedule				Chattel mortgages and other liens payable			
Real estate mortgages receivable				Other debts - itemize			
Autos and other personal property							
Cash value - life insurance							
Other assets - itemize							
				Total Liabilities			
				Net Worth			
Total Assets				Total Liabilities and net worth			
CONTINGENT LIABILITIES				GENERAL INFORMATION			
As endorser, comaker or guarantor				Are any assets pledged? (Add schedule)			
On leases or contracts				Are you defendant in any suits or legal actions?			
Legal claims				Have you ever taken bankruptcy?			
Provisions for Federal Income Tax							
Other special debt							

APPENDIX III

OUTLINE OF CONFIDENTIAL FORMAL REPORT PREPARED BY EVALUATOR AND DISTRIBUTED ONLY TO STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

CONFIDENTIAL FORMAL REPORT

[DATE]

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

FORMAL REPORT

TO:

[Name of Chair]
Chair, Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary

FROM:

[Evaluator/Circuit Member]

NAME:

[Name of Prospective Nominee or Nominee (hereafter, “prospective nominee” refers to either a “prospective nominee” or a “nominee.”)]

COURT:

[Name of Court to Which Nominated]

ADDRESS:

[Office Address]
[Home Address]

APPENDIX III

DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH:

EDUCATION:

[List of all colleges and universities, degrees, dates of graduation, honors, etc.]

PROFESSIONAL (EMPLOYMENT RECORD):

[List of and description of all professional positions, including law firms, governmental positions, etc., with relevant dates]

BAR AND COURT ADMISSIONS:

[List all jurisdictions and courts in whichever admitted, including dates of admission]

MILITARY SERVICE AND DRAFT STATUS:

[Rank, type of discharge, date of discharge]

DISCIPLINARY HISTORY:

[Description of any disciplinary activity – Prospective nominee's list disciplinary actions in their PDQs, and a waiver is obtained so that Committee members may verify disciplinary history with appropriate authorities. Evaluators may discuss any disciplinary actions with appropriate representatives of the disciplinary authority and with a prospective nominee.]

MARTINDALE-HUBBELL:

[Martindale rating and summary report on Martindale-Hubbell file.]

NEWSPAPER FILE:

[Review of online, newspaper and print references to a prospective nominee.]

RECOMMENDATION:

[Qualified, Well Qualified, Not Qualified]

APPENDIX III

MATRIX OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

[Evaluators typically prepare a table or matrix of all lawyers, judges, and other persons contacted and state whether an interview was conducted. The matrix notes whether the interviewee was identified by the prospective nominee in the PDQ. This allows the Committee to readily ascertain whether all persons identified in the PDQ have been contacted. The Committee attempts to contact all persons identified by the prospective nominee in the PDQ.]

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

[This section provides a full summary of the confidential interviews with every lawyer, judge and all persons contacted concerning the professional competence, temperament, and integrity of the prospective nominee, including full name and description of the interviewee (i.e. name of lawyer, name of firm, city of practice), and a summary of all comments made by the interviewees, both positive and adverse, concerning the prospective nominee. The contacts are questioned about the potential nominee's knowledge of the law, legal, analytic and reasoning abilities, and judgment, etc. If adverse comments are made, interviewees are asked to identify other sources with personal knowledge of the adverse information. Follow-up is conducted on all adverse comments. Any adverse comments are discussed with the prospective nominee and included in the interview summary. The Committee does not use anonymous or unsolicited information unless it can be confirmed.]

FEDERAL JUDGES:

[Evaluators contact judges at all levels with knowledge of the professional qualifications of the prospective nominee: Supreme Court, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, Magistrate Judges and Bankruptcy Judges.]

STATE JUDGES:

[Evaluators contact State judges at all levels that may have knowledge of the professional qualifications of the prospective nominee.]

LAWYERS:

[Lawyers contacted include those listed in the PDQ (opposing counsel and co-counsel, etc.) and a broad cross section of the bar (those identified through database searches and interviews), law professors, representatives of various bar associations and prominent practitioners with knowledge of the nominee's professional qualifications.]

OTHERS:

[Interviews are frequently conducted with non-lawyers, such as court personnel and community members.]

APPENDIX III

WRITINGS

[This section includes a full description of the writings of the prospective nominee that discuss the nominee's writing style, clarity, legal analysis, etc. In addition to writing samples provided by the prospective nominee, writings are obtained from public sources such as reporters, LEXIS NEXIS, Westlaw, law reviews and other lawyers. Often a representative sample of the writings will be included with the Formal Report.]

SUMMARY OF PERSONAL INTERVIEW OF PROSPECTIVE NOMINEE

[This section is a detailed narrative of the interview of the prospective nominee and contains a summary of all matters discussed, impressions of the evaluator, and responses to any adverse comments received during the interview, etc. If the prospective nominee is a judge, special attention is paid to recusal and conflict of interest issues.]

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

[In this section, the Evaluator provides conclusions reached from all information gathered and makes a recommendation of Well-Qualified, Qualified or Not Qualified. The recommendation is supported by the detailed reasoning of the evaluator, often references the interviews and writings of the prospective nominee, and specifically analyzes the criteria of professional competence, integrity and judicial temperament.]

EXHIBITS

[Complete Personal Data Questionnaire and Financial Statement (Public Portion).]

[Other Exhibits (such as Martindale-Hubbell, selected writings, opinions, newspaper articles).]

[Prior Formal Reports of any prospective nominees previously evaluated by the Standing Committee.]

APPENDIX IV

CHAIRS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

2008-2010 Kim J. Askew Dallas, TX	1998-1999 Michael S. Greco Boston, MA	1987-1989 Harold R. Tyler, Jr.* New York, NY	1972-1973 Robert L. Trescher* Haverford, PA
2007-2008 C. Timothy Hopkins Idaho Falls, ID	1997-1998 Blake Tartt Houston, TX	1984-1987 Robert B. Fiske New York, NY	1968-1972 Lawrence E. Walsh Oklahoma City, OK
2006-2007 Roberta D. Liebenberg Philadelphia, PA	1996-1997 Judah Best Washington, D.C.	1983-1984 Frederick G. Buesser, Jr.* Detroit, MI	1965-1968 Albert E. Jenner* Chicago, IL
2005-2006 Stephen L. Tober Portsmouth, NH	1995-1996 Carolyn B. Lamm Washington, D.C.	1980-1983 Brooksley Elizabeth Born Washington, D.C.	1962-1965 Robert W. Meserve* Boston, MA
2003-2005 Thomas Z. Hayward, Jr. Chicago, IL	1994-1995 William E. Willis New York, NY	1978-1980 Robert D. Raven* San Francisco, CA	1957-1962 Bernard G. Segal* Philadelphia, PA
2002-2003 Carol E. Dinkins Houston, TX	1993-1994 Robert P. Watkins Washington, D.C.	1977-1978 R. Harvey Chappell, Jr. Richmond, VA	1956-1957 Morrison Shafroth* Denver, CO
2001-2002 Roscoe Trimmier, Jr. Boston, MA	1992-1993 William E. Willis New York, NY	1975-1977 Warren Christopher Los Angeles, CA	1956-1956 Franklin E. Parker, Jr.* New York, NY
2000-2001 Patricia M. Hynes New York, NY	1991-1992 Ronald L. Olson Los Angeles, CA	1974-1975 William Reece Smith, Jr. Tampa, FL	1954-1956 Edward J. Fox* Eastern, PA
1999-2000 N. Lee Cooper Birmingham, AL	1989-1991 Ralph I. Lancaster, Jr. Portland, ME	1973-1974 John Sutro* San Francisco, CA	1952-1954 Howard F. Burns* Cleveland, OH

*Deceased

