



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

Held via Zoom
Tuesday, July 21, 2026
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	Excused
Lindsey Brandt	Excused	Kimberly Farnsworth	Present
Christopher Martinez	Present	Ciriack Alvarez Valle	Present
J. Brett Chambers	Present	Elizabeth Wright – <i>Ex Officio</i>	Present
Janine Liebert	Present	Andrea Donahue – <i>Staff</i>	Present
Megan Glasmann	Excused	Tanya Rosado – <i>Staff</i>	Present
		Tucker Samuelson – <i>Staff</i>	Present

GUEST(S)

Nectaria Kurth	Jayne Walters – <i>USU TCI</i>
Nathanael Player – <i>USU TCI</i>	Jason Velez – <i>1Law</i>
Chase Hertel – <i>Rasa Legal</i>	
Hayley Cousin – <i>CJAU</i>	

1. Discussion:

Alyson McAllister

Welcome and Public Comment

Ms. McAllister opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Velez thanked the Innovation Office for providing information on submitting an amendment request. He explained that his entity is exploring the High Innovation/high risk category and briefly described the model. There would be a certain amount of lawyer involvement; an autonomous delivery of services guided by lawyers. He is looking for insight from the Committee on whether it's something available prior to the sunset.

2. Vote:

Alyson McAllister

Approval of June Meeting Minutes

Ms. McAllister invited a motion for approval of the June 2026 Meeting minutes.

Mr. Martinez moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Chambers seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

3. Update:

Andrea Donahue

Phase 3 – Court Conference

Ms. Donahue provided an update from the conference with the Supreme Court in June. She informed the Committee that the Supreme Court confirmed its understanding that, for consideration of the new Phase 3 application standard requiring a plausible connection to future reforms, there is currently no pathway for for-profit ALPs.

Additionally, she thanked the Data Working Group for their work on the Sandbox consumer survey. The consumer survey has been provided to the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee Chairs for their consideration when forming their recommendations and will not be implemented for the remainder of the Sandbox. The Supreme Court noted the late stage in the Sandbox and the feedback from entities regarding their own surveys.

The focus for the LSI Committee is winding down for the sunset.

4. Discussion and Vote:

Brett Chambers

Amendment Request

Mr. Chambers gave an overview of USU TCI's amendment request that would expand their scope through three major components: six additional practice areas, using the term "helping professionals," and allowing negotiations on behalf of clients.

Mr. Player spoke on behalf of USU TCI and described his background with the Utah state courts and LSI Committee.

Ms. Donahue clarified for the Committee that she had spoken with Nick Stiles, Appellate Court Administrator, and five of the practice areas would be deferred to the Ad Hoc Regulatory Reform Committee as they are planned for implementation after the sunset of the Sandbox. The LSI Committee's scope is for the Sandbox project, and the Ad Hoc Committee's scope is for the post-Sandbox period. Mr. Player stated they were interested in requesting provisional authorization. Ms. Donahue explained that provisional authorization was a category that allowed entities additional time to develop services to launch in the Sandbox. It isn't applicable with the limited time remaining in the project.

Mr. Player expressed a concern with the uncertainty of the transition and described a potential for things falling through the cracks with the courts. Ms. Donahue expressed that the concern was noted and could be provided to the Supreme Court, however, the Committee must adhere to the process set by the Court. The scope of what is available to be authorized within the Sandbox is limited to activities which would be implemented within the time of the Sandbox. Mr. Hafen asked a clarifying question as to whether the LSI Committee was voting on expanding practice areas, and Ms. Donahue explained that landlord/tenant is the practice area identified by USU TCI for implementation in the Sandbox.

Ms. McAllister expressed her view that the need and value of CJAs is recognized by the LSI Committee, Ad Hoc Committee, and the Supreme Court. She conveyed to Mr. Player that she didn't think there was a risk of CJAs falling through the cracks but that the separate committees operate in their own confines.

Ms. Chambers asked USU TCI whether approval of the landlord/tenant practice area would allow it to secure the funding needed. Mr. Player clarified that the funding had been received.

Mr. Chambers raised a broader concern regarding the Governmental Immunity Act and how that could potentially prevent a consumer, who may be harmed, from having a remedy. Mr. Player described the structure of the CJA program, which includes training from USU TCI and supervision from Nonprofit Legal Services. The CJAs provide services as part of the nonprofit or organization they work for. Mr. Chambers raised the question of a remedy for inadequate training, and Ms. McAllister brought up the role of malpractice insurance. Mr. Player explained the motivation behind USU TCI's model -- solving the challenges facing nonprofits for Sandbox participation -- and compared USU TCI with the role of other educational institutions such as law schools. Ms. Donahue remarked for clarification that with USU TCI's CJA model, they are also the institution that is providing the certification.

Ms. Donahue expressed that the amendment would increase consistency across CJA programs, particularly with CJAU's authorization order. She also noted that, like debt collection, landlord/tenant has been identified by both national and local research, including the Utah Bar Foundation's report, as an area of high need.

Ms. McAllister asked the Committee to consider voting on the "helping professionals" definition, the landlord/tenant legal practice area, and the ability to negotiate. Ms. Donahue referenced Ms. Glasmann's remarks in the previous Committee meeting and asked that the definition of "helping professions" be included for the objective of providing clarity for consumers.

Mr. Martinez motioned to vote on the recommendation for the three amendment request components and the additional request made. Mr. Chambers seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Martinez moved for the Committee to go into closed session. Mr. Hafen seconded the motion, and the Committee closed the meeting.

5. Applications

This item was tabled due to lack of time.

6. Voting on Items from Closed Session

The Committee did not vote on any items.

7. Phase 3

This item was tabled due to lack of time.

8. Phase 3

Ms. Donahue provided an update Rasa Legal submitted a notification of withdrawal, which will go the Supreme Court for a termination order. Mr. Samuelsen stated that he will need the date of withdraw because Rasa receives data from the Court. Mr. Hertel responded that the requested withdrawal date is September 30th. He expressed thanks on behalf of Rasa for the opportunity to participate in the program.

Mr. Chambers moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Farnsworth seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned.