



OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES INNOVATION

An Office of the Utah Supreme Court

Approved LSI Committee Meeting Minutes November 29, 2022

Attendees

Board Members:

John Lund, Chair
Sue Crismon, Executive Director
Dr. Rebecca Sandefur
Lucy Ricca

Contractors:

Helen Lindamood

Excused:

Dr. Tom Clarke

1. Welcome: (John Lund)

Mr. Lund welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Ms. Ricca motioned to approve the minutes as drafted. Dr. Sandefur seconded, and the motion passed without objection.

2. Discussion and Action: Enforcement and Badge Policies

Enforcement Policy

The Board discussed the new Enforcement Policy drafted and proposed by the Policy Committee. Mr. Lund expressed concern about the policy's complexity regarding enforcement and asked if there has been an analysis of the workload impact of this new policy. Ms. Crismon said no was a formal analysis, but this policy is less a whole new system and more of a clarification of the system the Office is currently using and clear communication of expectations to Sandbox participants. Dr. Sandefur seconded concerns that the Office doesn't have the manpower. Mr. Lund suggested that instead of formalizing the enforcement process, perhaps the Office should use a "use your best judgment" approach. Ms. Ricca suggested the Policy Committee could simplify the Blue category, and that wouldn't be much beyond current operation with some clarification on what is Data vs. Executive Director on enforcement responsibilities. Ms. Ricca also suggested the Committee should discuss whether any fines would be associated with infractions.

The Committee moved to return the proposed Enforcement Policy to the Policy Committee for simplification revisions.

Badge Policy

The Board discussed the revised Badge and Disclosure Policy drafted and proposed by the Policy Committee. The revisions were updated disclosure language based on feedback from participants and the changed privilege rules, additional requirements on badge display requirements, and change to the Badge Language from “regulated” to “authorized”

Mr. Lund said the Court was fairly adamant about “regulated” on the badge when the current badge was discussed; the Court is not likely to accept the badge change. He questioned whether there is a driving need to prioritize this change with all the other changes on the docket. Ms. Crismon responded that this was just a recommendation based on participant feedback.

The Committee moved to present the updated disclosure language and the new badge display requirements to the Court as drafted but not the new proposed badge.

3. Discussion and Action: Legal Rebel (Sue Crismon)

After meeting with the entity to discuss their application, Ms. Crismon confirmed Legal Rebel is proposing practicing law, and she is comfortable advancing to the Court as a High Innovation entity. Legal Rebel proposes working with three lawyer contractors as Chief Legal Officers with 5% ownership who develop software and training. Legal Rebel would be subject to pre-launch assessment if the Court accepts the new risk assessment model and provisional authorization for both the ALP models. The Committee noted that the draft did not include the provisional authorization language, which Ms. Crismon added during the meeting.

The Committee moved to present the recommendation to Court with the changes discussed.

4. Discussion and Action: Darrow AI (Sue Crismon)

After meeting with the entity to discuss their application, Ms. Crismon reported that Darrow AI proposes working as an intermediary platform with marketing and client acquisition services but does not practice law under the Office’s current definition. She also noted that Darrow AI currently operating in Arizona. The Committee discussed some slight edits to the drafted recommendation.

The Committee tabled the recommendation to circulate the final draft via email.

5. Discussion and Action: Entity Withdrawal and Amendment Orders (Sue Crismon and John Lund)

Withdrawals

Law HQ. They met with Crismon and Lund to discuss their issues with slow development, state law issues, and not using outside investment. The Office confirmed it was in LawHQ’s best interest to withdraw and reapply later.

Ms. Crismon raised considering a separate Re-application in light of application fees.

Blue Bee Bankruptcy has not reported data since February despite the Tier Two notification in August but did respond to Sue's notification of Termination with a Request for Withdrawal.

Utah Legal Advocates requested withdrawal because their model isn't making money.

The Committee moved to present the proposed Orders to Court as drafted.

Amendments

HW Amendment requested an amendment because their name was too long for SurveyMonkey's name field.

Lindenberg is requested to add Civil Rights authorization in light of the civil rights crossover with employment discrimination cases.

The Committee moved to present the proposed Orders to Court as drafted.

6. Report: D4U: (John Lund)

The entity is still under investigation. A report and discussion will likely continue at the next conference.

7. Discussion and Action: December 7th Court Conference Packet

The Committee discussed the agenda and priorities for the upcoming conference.

8. Report: Operations Committee (John Lund)

The internship decision needs to be made, primarily who would be "responsible" for the intern. Mr. Lund volunteered to take on this task. Ms. Ricca recommended removing data research and admin support tasks from the intern tasks. Alternatively, the Court could take on interns directly. Mr. Lund plans to discuss this matter with J. Hagan and the data team's benefit reporting document before the 12/21 conference.

9. Adjournment and Next Meeting:

The meeting adjourned at 11:26 AM. The next meeting will be December 13, 2022, from 10:00 - 11:30 AM MST.