



Meeting Minutes Supreme Court's Office of Legal Services Innovation Committee

Held via Zoom
Tuesday, December 16, 2025
1:00 pm to 2:30 pm

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Alyson Carter McAllister – <i>Chair</i>	Present	Barclay Burns	Excused
Nick Hafen – <i>Vice Chair</i>	Present	Gretchen Lee	Present
Lindsey Brandt	Present	Kimberly Farnsworth	Present
Christopher Martinez	Present	Ciriac Alvarez Valle	Present
J. Brett Chambers	Excused	Nick Stiles – <i>Staff</i>	Present
Janine Liebert	Excused	Elizabeth Wright – <i>Ex Officio</i>	Excused
Megan Glasmann	Present	Andrea Donahue – <i>Staff</i>	Present
		Tanya Rosado – <i>Staff</i>	Present

GUEST(S)

Jon Wayas – <i>Bar Staff</i>	Jessica Bednarz – <i>IAALS</i>
Ramon Samoza – <i>Synergy Legal</i>	Jayne Walters – <i>USU TCI</i>
Chris Lewis – <i>Lawgeex</i>	Kennady – <i>Pearson Butler</i>
Dejon Brooks	Maryt Fredrickson – <i>Court Staff</i>
Hayley Cousin – <i>CJAU</i>	Maribeth LeHoux – <i>Bar Staff</i>
	Jason Velez – <i>1Law</i>

1. Discussion: **Alyson McAllister**

Welcome and Public Comment

Ms. McAllister opened the floor for public comments. There were no comments.

2. Discussion: **Maryt Fredrickson**

Utah Supreme Court's Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee

Ms. Fredrickson introduced herself as the Chief of Staff to the Chief Justice and gave an overview of the Supreme Court's Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee, which is currently meeting regularly and drafting recommendations for the Supreme Court for after the Sandbox. Ms. Fredrickson explained that she and Nick Stiles are the Co-Chairs. She identified the four different working groups: Community Justice Advocates (CJAs),

Licensed Paralegal Practitioners (LPPs), Rule 5.4, and AI/Technology. Ms. Fredrickson explained that the four groups have been charged to look at the successes and lesson learned from the Sandbox as well as rule changes and initiatives in other states. They are looking at pathways for post-Sandbox. The plan is to have a proposal in the fall of 2026.

Additionally, Ms. Fredrickson gave examples of some of the questions and topics that the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee has been addressing, such as what can be done to revitalize the LPP program and whether LPPs are closing the access-to-justice gap. Another question to be addressed is how to fund regulatory needs. Ms. Fredrickson mentioned the importance of stakeholders having a voice in future decisions. In February, there will be a preliminary report.

3. Discussion:

Jon Wayas

Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Program

Mr. Wayas introduced himself as the NLTP and LPP Administrator and gave an overview of the LPP Program. He explained that the legal areas of practice allowed are currently family law, debt collection, and evictions. Mr. Wayas described some of the requirements and informed the Committee that UCJA 14-802 outlines the limitations for LPPs. LPPs can go to court with clients for emotional support and coach clients before court; they can also answer questions about the case if the judge asks.

Mr. Wayas opened it up to questions from the Committee. Ms. Glasmann mentioned that the Policy/Compliance group has discussed the topic of alternative legal providers in the Sandbox and how to move forward. She asked about the original intent of the LPP program. Mr. Wayas responded that the intent was access to justice, but the bigger question is what exactly that means. Without clear definitions, it is hard to know if they are hitting the desired benchmarks.

Mr. Wayas provided information on the number of LPPs and described programs in other jurisdictions, such as Colorado and Arizona. Most LPPs in Utah practice family law; other areas are harder to practice in and may not be as feasible financially.

Ms. Brandt agreed with the question regarding how to define access to justice and noted that it is hard to say if the mark is being met. Ms. Glasmann asked if they'll be reaching out to other states, and Mr. Wayas explained that a lot of them are in the initial stages, but they'll reach out as needed.

4. Discussion:

Nick Stiles

Request to Include CJAs in the Bar Directory

Mr. Stiles presented a request to the Committee from the Administrative Office of the Courts/Supreme Court to list CJAs on the Bar's website as is done with lawyers. Mr. Stiles explained that this came up in the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform discussions. Ms. Donahue gave some background as to her understanding that this wasn't done in the past due to the Sandbox's original focus on entity regulation rather than individual providers.

The floor opened up for Committee discussion. Mr. Wayas and Mr. Stiles discussed how this might work with LPPs, and Mr. Wayas reported that he had discussed this with Bar's IT. Right now, it would be expensive to add to the licensed lawyer website. Mr. Stiles explained that the intention was less for an advertising tool and more to identify people. Ms. Brandt noted that LPPs are in the member directory. Ms. Glasmann opined that if it's not cost prohibitive, the list should be on a place where consumers can verify that people are who they say they are. Mr. Wayas said they might find a program where people can search for a category (lawyer, LPP, or CJA).

Mr. Martinez asked if this means the project is now individual-focused rather than entity-focused. Ms. McAllister responded that it makes sense to include anyone who could be practicing law. Ms. Brandt asked about how monitoring could work. Ms. Donahue noted the potential challenge that CJAs are not employees of the legal services entities, so this could contribute to turnover and the need for updates. Ms. Donahue also explained that this request seems to stem from the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee discussion regarding judicial awareness of CJAs.

Prior to moving to the next item, Ms. McAllister allowed a request for public comment from Mr. Velez, who asked if there is any direction for Exiting the Sandbox, noting his understanding that the landscape has changed dramatically. Ms. McAllister answered that the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee is looking into post-Sandbox rule changes. Mr. Stiles identified himself as a contact for the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee. Ms. Donahue reiterated that the Supreme Court paused the Exit policy.

5. **Vote:**

Alyson McAllister

Approval of November Meeting Minutes

Ms. McAllister invited a motion for approval of the November 2025 Meeting minutes.

Ms. Brandt moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Glasmann seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Glasmann moved for the Committee to enter into closed session. Ms. Brandt seconded the motion, and the Committee closed the meeting.

6. **Post-Closed Session**

Ms. McAllister called for votes on agenda items.

Ms. Brandt moved to recommend denial of Baytok Law's application as a for-profit immigration entity and for not having a Utah-specific model. Ms. Glasmann seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. Ms. McAllister noted that the denial should include the warning language discussed by the Committee.

Ms. Glasmann moved to send letters to High Innovation/Provisional entities with expired orders. Ms. Farnsworth seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. McAllister moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brandt seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned.