President’s Message

Peter Marchel

Dear Fellow Washington ACC Members:

This will be my last column as president of the Washington Chapter. Thank you for the opportunity to serve as your president for the last two years. I would like to thank our chapter board of directors and our chapter administrator, Lynda Jonas, for all their work during the last two years, who have worked to bring you timely and relevant CLE programs in fun and different venues. Some highlights from the programs held over the past two years include:

- First “Meet the Board” after-hours wine and cheese
- Blue Ribbon Cooking School CLE
- The Annual ACC Conference in October 2008
- M’s Game CLE in 2008
- Holiday Annual Ethics Dinner at the Columbia Tower
- M’s Game CLEs in June and July 2009

During this time, we have also seen our chapter membership grow to over 400 members, and we continue to provide scholarships for minority students at each of the state’s law schools. (Please see the article within this newsletter about where some of the scholarship recipients are now.)

We have several more exciting programs remaining in 2009. Your board and several of the chapter committees have been meeting since the end of 2008 to lay out and schedule CLE and social programs throughout the year. Please visit the chapter website at www.acc.com/chapters/wash for information about upcoming events as well as past materials and a report of previous activities. As always, if you would like to write an article or have ideas for the type of material you would like to see in the newsletter, please contact Heather Deranek at heather.daranek@onrequestimages.com or Lynda Jonas at ljonas@legalease.com.

I encourage you to attend the events our current chapter will hold this year. Where else can you get your required CLE credits within areas that are specifically in line with your job responsibilities?

Peter Marchel
I couldn’t decide which topic I really wanted to write about most for this quarter’s chapter newsletter. One describes an incredible advance for in-house counsel and the value returned for their client’s legal spend; and the other, which describes what may be the greatest bite into your practical ability to assert attorney work product protections in the history of my tenure here. So you get both — I told you I couldn’t decide!

**Bad News First: “Work-Product Protection” is now an oxymoron**

On August 13, 2009, the First Circuit Court of Appeals issued an en banc opinion that has severe and negative ramifications for corporate clients — and even greater consequences for the in-house lawyers and financial teams that prepare corporate tax, accounting and financial statements for them.

In *US v. Textron*, the court overruled its own previous panel decision (and departs from the precedent of virtually every other US court), protecting the traditional and widely accepted interpretation of what constitutes attorney work product in the disclosure and financial reporting context. The IRS sought production of Textron’s lawyers’ estimates of the company’s potential liability for tax positions it pursued, Textron asserted attorney-work product protections and refused to disclose the files, and the ping pong of decisions in this case began. (ACC filed two amicus briefs in the case, available online along with the court’s decisions, at the URLs listed at the end of this article.)

This most recent *Textron* decision is final, unless the company decides to take the case to the US Supreme Court (and we’ll be there again as amicus, if they decide to go forward). It is important to overturn this ruling and have the Supremes resolve this important issue, or public companies’ in-house lawyers will be hamstrung with little alternative except to avoid any documentation of estimated litigation liabilities and, perhaps by extension, other forms of litigation reserves if the lawyer wishes to be able to assert confidentiality over such work product.

Perhaps more importantly, from a policy perspective, this case could be a watershed moment in establishing and defining work product protections that truly make or break the role of lawyers in a public company context.

The court’s ruling replaces a longstanding test that protects documents prepared by attorneys because of or in anticipation of litigation (constituting protected attorney work product as defined in the US Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 26(b)) in favor of one that suggests a much narrower standard, if any remaining protection at all. The court argued that Textron’s attorneys’ assessments of potential litigation liability for tax positions were not protected because financial reporting and accounting requirements dictate creation of such liability estimates, and thus any resulting work papers are mere “business” documents created pursuant to those requirements.

According to the court, “any lawyer” would call Textron’s counsel’s assessment of potential liability mere tax or business documents, not litigation documents. But by “any lawyer,” the court sure wasn’t talking about the 24,000 members of ACC. If a lawyer’s assessment of the company’s potential legal liability for a position it asserted — which the government now challenges — isn’t attorney work product, what the heck is? The court makes a twisted and Herculean effort to reach the perverse result it adopts.

In adopting this standard, the court seeks to promote greater convenience for government investigators at the expense of the public interest in promoting accurate and complete preparation of corporate financial documents and audits. By ignoring or setting aside clear precedent to protect attorney work product, such as estimation of potential liabilities, this court eviscerates the notion that the in-house lawyer should create or share legal assessments with internal financial colleagues or the company’s auditors.

As noted by the dissent in this case (who are the judges who wrote the panel opinion that this *en banc* court overrules): “In adopting its test, the majority ignores a tome of precedents from the circuit courts and contravenes much of the principles underlying the work-product doctrine. It also brushes aside the actual text of Rule 26(b)(3), which “[n]owhere . . . state[s] that a document must have been prepared to aid in the conduct of litigation in order to constitute work product.” *Adlman*, 134 F.3d at 1198.” The result is that companies that empower their lawyers and auditors to work together in an effort to ensure that their financials and accounting disclosures are accurate and well-informed are punished by this decision. The court thus suggests the inconceivable: that it is more advisable for lawyers to avoid documenting or sharing information that could be used against the company’s interests in litigation. In citing to ACC’s amicus brief in this matter, the dissent notes further: “Thus, as *amicus* worry, the majority’s new rule will have ramifications that will affect the form and detail of documents attorneys prepare when working to convince auditors of the soundness of a corporation’s reserves.”

And that means that the role of in-house counsel is not only hamstrung, it’s permanently damaged. The court’s ruling continued on page 3. 
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**Oxymorons and Indexes**

**Susan Hackett**
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hackett@acc.com
diminishes the value of the important preventive and strategic roles that in-house counsel play in complex, publicly traded companies. And calls into question the entire notion public policy presumption that confidential legal counsel encourages better corporate decision-making and more reliable and accurate public statements of financial position on which our markets must rely. In pursuit of greater transparency for IRS investigators in this one case, the court ends up promoting opposite result in the larger marketplace. Bad facts made bad law here. ACC will continue to fight to protect your client’s right to expect candid and confidential counsel, and your ability to protect the work product that makes your contributions to the company’s good fiscal health possible.

To read ACC’s amicus briefs and the court’s decisions, go to ACC’s Advocacy Homepage (www.acc.com/advocacy) or use the following URLs:

U.S. v Textron Decision, 8/13/09: www.ca1.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/getopn.pl?OPINION=07-2631EB.01A


Remember: ACC advocacy is the voice of the in-house bar. We perform that function by engaging in work that protects individual members’ practice rights and their companies’ rights to counsel of choice: in-house lawyers. Textron came to us for help in taking this case on. You should, too, if your company faces a problem that impacts in-house practice and professional standards like this one does. We don’t have the resources to become involved in every case but we can’t be the voice of the in-house bar unless we speak out on matters that truly impact YOU. Call me when you see those cases; that’s how we move the needle and make sure that the in-house bar is your voice.

I’d rather leave you with the good news: The ACC Value Index is about to turn inefficient and non-aligned law firm business models “inside out.”

The premise of the ACC Value Challenge (our project to reconnect the cost of legal services to their value) is our belief that far too often, what drives the definition of success in outside law firms is size, expensive reputation and profitability. While we can’t stop folks in firms from reading the AmLaw 200 rankings and measuring themselves against these metrics, maybe we can redirect the definition of success toward something more closely aligned with what clients value.

That’s where the ACC Value Index comes in: the idea is to ask ACC members to share information about the firms they value most on an online database (the ACC Value Index). The intake form for the ACC Value Index is now up and online for ACC members to go to to pre-populate the system with data for launch. The form presents you with a simple scoring system, asking you to give 1 to 5 stars to firms you use on six different value criteria. Once launched (at the ACC Annual Meeting in Boston in October), members will also be able to go to the database to search for returns — information about firms they might be considering or to see how their own firms stack up. If you want to find the firms that scored well for value in other members’ hearts — say, attorneys in California who do employment law or lawyers in France who do commercial litigation — the system will return the information. Data can be further sliced and diced, too. With the ACC Value Index, you’ll be able to see what other members think of their firms and then connect with them for more information if you need it. It’s not designed to be complex. It’s designed to give a quick, down-and-dirty sense of which firms are most valued, and then connect members who have experience with a firm to members who want more info on them.

If you are willing to help us populate the system, go to www.acc.com/evaluate and tell us how you feel about your firms and the value they offer. Fill in multiple forms for each firm you feel strongly about: the form only takes about 30 seconds to complete and submit, unless you wish to write explanatory comments or accolades for your favorite lawyers at the firm in the comment box.

The full system that allows searching of the data will be out in beta soon for those who entered data as part of this push so that you can see how the system works, play around with it and decide if you want to keep the postings you made, and either edit or remove them. So this is a no-risk proposition — but imagine the upside of having candid peer reviews of firms (“candid” since the system is only open to ACC members) at your fingertips 24/7, covering firms around the world and allowing you to find the “value-based” expertise you need from outside counsel.

Imagine also the impact on the law firm community: maybe it will become at least as important to have satisfied clients promoting your value than to advertise that you’re the most expensive firm in the market and your profit-per-partner is 20 times the salary of the in-house counsel who hire you. Kind of makes you feel like maybe we’re the folks who hold the purse strings after all, doesn’t it?

If you would like more info on the ACC Value Index, feel free to contact my team leaders at accvalueindex@acc.com. Your peers (and your firms) are anxiously waiting to hear who you like and who it is that drives value in your outside legal relationships and spend.
Recent Events

May 7, 009
Street Law Conference
Chapter volunteers hosted students from Chief Sealth High School in West Seattle at a one-day conference at Safeco Center as part of the Corporate Legal Diversity Pipeline Program. This concluded a very successful and rewarding collaboration. Volunteer attorneys and paralegals visited Pam Mushen's classroom eight times this spring, teaching lessons on torts and sexual harassment. The one-day conference added on to the skills the students learned in the classroom. The torts group conducted the mini-trial of an auto accident involving a cyclist, a young driver and a distracted soccer mom. The sexual harassment group mediated a claim brought by a female lifeguard against the pool company where she worked. Over the lunch hour, the students played career bingo to get to know the volunteers better and learn more about the many paths they took to get to their current legal jobs. It was a fantas-tic experience — one that the students and volunteers will long remember.

Thank you to our volunteers Susan Ephron, Heather Deranek, Frances Skeete, Andrew Fisher, Karen Klein, Michelle Marchant, Bob Taylor, Don DeShaw, Kathleen Albrecht, Wendi Okun, Michael Newman, Jin Kim, Karin Hansen, Zabrina Jenkins, Eric De Los Santos and Todd Elliot.

The program is slated to run again this fall, so look for an announcement. We hope you will join us.

Tuesday, June 16, 2009
CLE presentation sponsored by Lane Powell
“Legal Implications of Financial Reporting”
Gary Tober, shareholder at Lane Powell, led a discussion regarding key situations in financial reporting that require careful examination by corporate counsel. Topics at the informative breakfast session included: basics of accounting and financial information, accounting red flags and ethical responsibilities, financial reporting of business red flags, and upcoming and developing issues.

Thursday, June 25, 2009
CLE presentation and Mariners game
Sponsored by Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP
“Trade Secrets: Cost-Effective Protection for Valuable Business Information”
Roger D. Wylie, Partner, Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP, and Richard L. Grossman, Chair, Trade Secrets Group, Partner, Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP conducted a CLE presentation to a full house in a suite at Safeco Field prior to a Mariners game. Topics included: initiating practical and cost-effective corporate trade secret protection plans, possible remedies in IP protection caused by recent developments in patent law, identifying technology and valuable business information to be protected by trade secret law, common pitfalls encountered by corporate counsel in establishing a trade secret protection plan, handling the arrival and departure of employees who have trade secret information, maintaining the confidentiality of trade secrets in varying countries, and other trade secret issues.

Attendees commented on how much they enjoyed the informative CLE. The weather cooperated to produce a beautiful sunny day, and after the CLE, attendees were able to watch the Mariners win the game from the suite.
Attorneys Lend a Hand During a Time of Need
By Attorney General Rob McKenna

In one of the worst economic downturns since the Great Depression, attorneys from the public and private sectors are stepping up to lend a hand to struggling consumers.

At the heart of this recession are homeowners facing severe pressure on their ability to pay their mortgages. Adjustable interest rates are going up while employment opportunities shrink. Making matters worse, scam artists and fraudulent businesses exploit homeowners’ suffering. That’s why now more than ever, we’re doing everything we can in the Attorney General’s Office to protect Washington State consumers.

Last October, we announced a landmark settlement that I helped broker with Bank of America, requiring its sub-prime lending subsidiary Countrywide Financial Corp. to provide loan modifications for as many as 395,000 borrowers nationwide. Nearly 10,000 Washington homeowners will receive about $200 million in payment relief. The settlement resolves allegations that Countrywide employed unfair and deceptive tactics in its loan-origination and servicing activities, and that borrowers were often put in structurally unaffordable loans.

Under the settlement agreement, Bank of America and eligible borrowers are modifying their loan terms to make monthly payments more affordable. Modified loan terms vary according to the circumstances of the borrower but may include an automatic interest rate freeze or reduction, conversion to a fixed-term loan, and principal refinancing or reduction.

Threats to state families on the brink of foreclosure also arise from a new type of bottom-feeder. Earlier this month, I announced that our office has joined the Federal Trade Commission and other states in a nationwide crackdown on “foreclosure rescuers” and loan modification businesses that charge hefty upfront fees and often provide little or no help. This includes five new cases by our Consumer Protection Division, more than doubling the number of foreclosure-assistance actions filed by my Office since 2007.

We took action after seeing a spike in complaints to our Consumer Resource Center. A woman in Brier reported that she called one such operation to ask for help in obtaining a mortgage modification. Instead, they took her $2,300 and she received nothing of value. “I had to file Chapter 13 to keep from losing my home,” she said. “[B]ecause of this company my home went into foreclosure.”

A common denominator in many of these cases is that often a homeowner could have received the same assistance at no cost had they personally contacted their lender or a nonprofit organization. Worse, these companies instruct homeowners not to talk to their lender or to stop making payments.

We filed suit against one California-based company for operating in Snohomish and Kitsap Counties without authorization, and for violating Washington’s Consumer Protection Act. In another case, a Burien homeowner who filed a complaint with the Attorney General’s Office said she and her brother paid a modification firm an upfront fee, but the company withdrew twice that amount from her checking account, causing an overdraft.

With so many borrowers looking for an opportunity to refinance or modify their loan terms, it’s not surprising that we’ve seen a new crop of shady operators looking to make an easy buck. But these frauds are not merely perpetrated by loan modification companies. When the housing bubble collapsed in September, our office called attention to “foreclosure rescue” operations. These companies approach homeowners on the brink, promising to help them keep their homes, but instead take their money, home, or equity.

Some “phantom help” scammers promise to negotiate a deal with lenders, charge high fees and provide nothing in return. Other “rent to buy” ploys lead homeowners to sign over their property by promising to sell the home back once the homeowners are back on their feet, while allowing them to remain in the home as tenants in the meantime. In the end, of course, the homeowner can’t buy the house back and the supposed rescuers take most, if not all, of the equity. A third “bait and switch” fraud involves tricking victims into signing documents purportedly for a new loan, but really transferring ownership of the home. Worse yet, the victims still owe the mortgages.

In response to these scams, our office mailed more than 14,000 letters to homeowners facing foreclosure because of missed mortgage payments. We also sent warning letters to county treasurers, for posting with tax foreclosure notices, and for distributing to their county web sites, local newsletters, and weekly newspapers. The letters warned at-risk homeowners about these scams.

While state attorneys general have come together to negotiate settlements with major lenders requiring loan modification programs and other remedies, many homeowners still find themselves in need of legal assistance to save their homes. That’s why we’ve partnered with private agencies to address such scams and to protect consumers.

This month, with the support of my office along with the Governor and Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) announced the opening of their Home Foreclosure Legal Aid Project. WSBA President Mark Johnson summed it up well: “In times of trouble, lawyers are there to help, stepping up to provide assistance to those in need and tangibly demonstrating generosity, kindness, and concern for the welfare of others.”

I’m proud to encourage the attorneys in my office to serve their communities through this project, and to be part of an “all hands on deck” approach to protecting the citizens of our state during a time of great economic vulnerability.
Law School Round-Up

In support of our law schools in Washington State, our Chapter is proud to present the following events and updates from our local law schools:

Seattle University Law School
Five SU Graduates Win Fellowships
Five recent graduates of Seattle University School of Law won coveted post-graduate fellowships to do public interest work:

Mike Clyburn ’09 accepted a prestigious position with the Presidential Management Fellows Program to work for two years in the in the region 10 office of the Community Planning and Development office of the Housing and Urban Development Office in Seattle.

Kristi Cruz ’08, the School of Law’s first Leadership for Justice Fellow, is working with the Northwest Justice Project in the areas of training, litigation, and creation of policies and procedures to increase awareness of and compliance with the legal requirement to provide access to services to limited-English proficient, and deaf and hard of hearing persons in Washington State.

Riddhi Mukhopadhyay ’09 received a fellowship from the Berkeley Law Foundation for work to be done at the Northwest Immigrant Rights Project. She will work with detainees at the Northwest Detention Center, specifically representing individuals with psychiatric and mental disabilities. She will also work toward policy reform at a national level on how detainees with mental illness are treated within detention centers.

Brian Rowe was selected for a Google Public Policy Fellowship to work at Public Knowledge in Washington, DC. The fellowship will give him firsthand experience working with legislators and activists on cutting-edge technology and access issues.

Persis Yu received the two-year Hanna S. Cohn Equal Justice Fellowship to work at Empire Justice in Rochester, NY. She will pursue litigation and advocacy work to address inaccuracies, misuse and bias in the credit reporting system. She will also work on consumer protection cases, develop a clinic to address fair credit reporting issues and pursue impact litigation and legislation.

Seattle University School of Law Team Argues before Inter-American Court
Two students and a professor from Seattle University School of Law’s International Human Rights Clinic presented oral arguments this summer before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, the highest tribunal for human rights matters in the hemisphere.

Marsha Mavunkel, a May 2009 graduate, and Garrett Oppenheim, who graduated in December 2008, along with Assistant Professor Tom Antkowiak, traveled to Costa Rica for the July 3 hearing. The Inter-American Court is one of only two active international human rights courts in the world. It has binding jurisdiction over states throughout the Americas. There are no appeals from court judgments and decisions. Cases often take years to reach the high tribunal and advisory opinion proceedings, such as the present matter, are infrequent.

“This is very exciting and unique learning opportunity for Marsha and Garrett, who both aspire to be international human rights lawyers,” Professor Antkowiak said. “The chance to argue before the Court is relatively rare, even for an experienced international litigator. This trip gives one example of the many opportunities available at the clinic to SU law students interested in practicing international human rights law.”

This invitation was a result of the clinic’s recent submission of a legal brief on a pending advisory opinion requested by the State of Argentina. Such opinions are only issued by the Court every few years — the last one was handed down in 2005 — and deal with significant human rights matters.

The clinic is also lead counsel on a case involving torture and illegal detention in Mexico and will soon file a complaint before the same human rights system.

University of Washington
Dean Kellye Testy will join the law school as the first permanent female dean in the school’s 110-year history. Many events are scheduled throughout the academic year to welcome Dean Testy and give the legal community a chance to hear her vision for the law school, including visits to Washington, DC, New York, Portland, Spokane and California. To find an event near you, check out www.law.washington.edu/events/welcome.

This year, the UW School of Law also celebrates its 30th anniversary of clinical law curriculum. In the 1970s, law students were increasingly turning to a career in law for justice and public interest — not always in search of the next open seat as partner in a firm. Law school faculty were looking for new ways to bring the law to life during their students’ three years of law school. As a result, then-law professor Charles Z. Smith, retired Washington State Supreme Court Justice, worked with then-attorney Marsha Pechman, now a US District Court judge, for the creation of the University Defender Services, the first clinical law program at the UW. What Smith and Pechman set out to do in 1979 was create a program that, as part of the law school’s curriculum, would provide valuable experience under the tutelage of faculty and practicing attorneys in service to the community.

A few years later, under the leadership of law professor Alan Kirtley, the clinical law program at the UW flourished. Over the past three decades, it has grown to over ten clinics, offering services to the community in various areas of the law, including tax and unemployment compensation, mediation, immigration, tribal court public defense, environmental, and child and youth advocacy. Outside of the legal skills they gain, clinics also offer students an opportunity to serve the community, sometimes with a very profound outcome.

continued on page 7
Gonzaga School of Law
Prelaw, a National Jurist publication, recently listed Gonzaga University School of Law as one of the most innovative law schools in the country. This recognition was based on the new and innovative curriculum that will be inaugurated with our fall 2009 1L class.

Gonzaga Law faculty adopted the curriculum changes that impressed Prelaw in May 2008. The revisions were adopted to ensure that the institution is delivering on its mission promise to provide students with an excellent legal education informed by its humanistic, Jesuit and Catholic traditions and values.

Under the new curriculum, the first-year program will contain six separate doctrinal courses totaling 22 credit hours — four credit hours of legal research and writing, and four credit hours split evenly between two new skills and professionalism labs.

The six doctrinal courses include civil procedure, contracts, property, torts, criminal law and a new course entitled “Perspectives on the Law.” The latter has been added to the fall semester, while the three-credit criminal law course has been moved from its traditional place in the fall semester to the spring.

The most significant change in the first-year program will be the addition of two new skills and professionalism labs. These labs will be bundled with two doctrinal courses each semester, and will focus on skill sets needed in two broad areas of practice to emphasize the professional values and habits that provide a foundation for the ethical practice of law.

During the fall semester of the first year, Gonzaga students will take a two-credit skills and professionalism lab that will use the rules of civil procedure and the substantive law of torts to teach them the skills they will need to be litigators.

During the spring semester, students will take a two-credit skills and professionalism lab that will use the substantive law of contracts and property to teach them the skills they will need to be transactional lawyers.

Each of these labs will be small sections of no more than 30 students, and will be taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty.

The most significant change in the second-year curriculum is the expansion and revision of the two LR&W classes. Staying true to the theme of “breaking down the silos within the academic program” established by the first-year curriculum revisions, LR&W III and IV will be reconstituted to build upon not only what students learned in their first-year LR&W classes (which has always been the practice), but also upon what they will have covered in their two skills and professionalism labs.

Following on the first-year fall semester skills and professionalism lab, LR&W III will focus on the research and writing skills lawyers need for a litigation practice. In the spring semester of the second year, LR&W IV will follow the transactional skills and professionalism lab by taking students through assignments that require the production of a variety of transactional documents (e.g., letters of intent, contracts, wills or trusts).

The only change in the third-year curriculum will be a new requirement that all students earn at least three credits in either the school’s clinic or its externship program. The impetus behind this change is to assure that all students graduate with some experience in applying their classroom knowledge and simulated skill set in an actual law practice setting.

continued from page 6

Last winter, for example, students working in the Innocence Project Northwest secured that clinic’s 13th conviction reversal for the wrongfully convicted.

For more hands-on experience outside of the classroom, two UW law students are taking their education one step further. Third-year law students Jen Marlow and Jeni Krenicki-Barcelos will travel to the United Nations Climate Change Conference Copenhagen 2009 (COP 15) in December to present recommendations for addressing the humanitarian crisis at the heart of climate change. The recommendations they bring are a result of a conference the two organized last spring. Three Degrees: The Law of Climate Change and Human Rights Conference brought together world leaders with expertise in climate change, human rights, public health, humanitarian relief, science, and international and US law. Participants included Mary Robinson, former president of Ireland; Henry Shue, senior research fellow at Oxford University’s Centre for International Studies; Bill Neukom, former president of the American Bar Association; and Marc Limon, an advisor to the Maldives Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and David Battisti, UW professor of atmospheric sciences.

“The collection of speakers and panelists could not have been surpassed, and the law school and university now have a place in an important conversation,” said Interim Dean Greg Hicks.

For more information about news and events, including CLE, at the UW School of Law, go to www.law.washington.edu.
**Board Members and Contacts**

**President**  
Peter Marchel  
Crump Insurance Services, Inc.  
425.488.5054  
peter.marchel@crumpins.com

**Vice President & Treasurer**  
Susan Ephron  
Safeco Corporate Legal  
206.473.5835  
susan.ephron@libertymutual.com

**Secretary**  
Heather Deranek  
OnRequest Images, Inc.  
206.774.1491  
heather.deranek@onrequestimages.com

**Board of Directors**  
Michael Anderson  
hchmca@worldnet.att.net

Richard Gordon  
TOC Holdings Co. (formerly Time Oil Co.)  
206.285.2400  
rgordon@tocholdings.com

Johann F. Thaheld  
360.301.0445  
archerjft@hotmail.com

Karen Klein  
Silver Planet, LLC  
206.498.4594  
kklein@silverplanet.com

**Chapter Administrator**  
Lynda Jonas  
Legal Ease, LLC  
425.822.1157  
ljonas@legalease.com

---

**ACC News**

**ACC Introduces QuickCounsel**

Too busy to research legal topics? No worries. Check out ACC’s newest online resource: *QuickCounsel*. These resources provide top-level information on important in-house topics, such as unrelated business income tax, selecting and managing international law firms, and marketing yourself in a challenging economy. Each *QuickCounsel* includes an overview and links to supporting materials for deeper information on the particular legal topic. To access *QuickCounsel*, go to [www.acc.com/quickcounsel](http://www.acc.com/quickcounsel).

**New Additions to ACC Website**

New resources are posted to the ACC website everyday! Here are a few examples:

*Quick references: Immigration Classifications and Visa Categories,*  
*Sample forms: Social Media Policy; Sample Arbitration Clauses with Comments.*

For more information, go to [www.acc.com](http://www.acc.com).

**ACC CLE Webcasts: Getting CLE Has Never Been Easier**

Wish you could enroll in an online course that is geared towards helping you do your job and get CLE? Your wish has come true. As of June 1st, ACC’s webcasts have evolved to give our members the option of purchasing CLE for only $75. Since then, hundreds of members have tuned in to see what all the buzz is about. If you don’t need CLE, then it’s free! Recent topics range from employment & labor issues to international RIF’s to FCPA compliance. If you miss the airdate, there’s no problem. You can still find the webcast on our archives. So what are you waiting for? Obtaining CLE has never been easier. For more information, go to: [webcasts.acc.com](http://webcasts.acc.com).

**The New Member Knowledge Network is at Your Service**

Previously known as “MemberToMember,” the Member Knowledge Network (MKN) allows you to reach out to ACC members who are willing to share their experiences and legal knowledge. MKN is exclusive to ACC members only. For more information, visit [www.acc.com/mkn](http://www.acc.com/mkn).

**Have a question about the Washington State Chapter?**

Interested in joining our legal community? Please feel free to contact any one of our board members with any questions you may have. We would be happy to talk with you and encourage you to join. Our chapter is always accepting new members!

**Have an idea for our next newsletter?**

Feel free to contribute! Please email questions or submission requests to heather.deranek@onrequestimages.com