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

Held via Zoom

Tuesday, August 18, 2026
1:00 pm to 2:30 pm

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

GUEST(S)
Nectaria Kurth
Hayley Cousin

1. **Discussion:** **Alyson McAllister**
   Welcome and Public Comment
   Ms. McAllister welcomed all attendees and opened the floor for public comments. There were no public comments.

2. **Vote:** **Alyson McAllister**
   Approval of July Meeting Minutes
   Ms. McAllister invited a motion for approval of the July 2026 Meeting minutes.

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

3. **Discussion and Vote:** **Andrea Donahue**
   Phase 3 **Chris Martinez**
   Ms. Donahue summarized the Committee's previous discussions regarding High Innovation/Provisionally Authorized entities, including concerns raised by members including Mr. Martinez, Ms. Alvarez, and Ms. Brandt. In light of the Supreme Court's Phase 3 announcement, staff drafted a notification to two of these former entities to inform them of

Phase 3 and that the Court is not currently exploring pathways for non-lawyer providers at for-profit companies outside of the LPP program.

Ms. McAllister raised that it might make sense to clarify that this doesn't include AI/technology-based services. The Committee considered this clarification and potential terminology to use other than "non-lawyer providers." Ms. Donahue explained that the Sandbox term of "human alternative legal provider" could be used, with the drawback that the language is a bit less natural. She proposed adding a footnote to address Ms. McAllister's suggestion. Members agreed with the option of adding a footnote.

Ms. Brandt moved to send the proposed letter to the High Innovation entities. Ms. Lee seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

To close out the discussion, Mr. Martinez expressed feedback about the previous High Innovation/Provisional authorizations. He described his involvement with the licensed paralegal practitioner (LPP) curriculum when it was first drafted and mentioned that a Sandbox entity had talked about doing this without the training and education that was put into place for LPPs. He expressed that he had thought it was an end run to the protections that were put in place for LPPs. Mr. Martinez raised that family law cases can be complex and touched on guardrails.

On a related note regarding legal tech and AI, Ms. Donahue reiterated that it is currently unknown where the Court is heading regarding AI. The Ad Hoc Committee AI Working Group's meetings left off with the consideration of a UPL carve out, but we won't know which direction the Court will go until they release their decision, so there is currently some ambiguity in this area. Mr. Hafen expressed that the initial feedback from the Court was that they were open, but there were no specific details. Ms. Donahue described that the AI Working Group had discussed core questions, such as whether the focus of regulation would be on more generalist models or legal service models.

4. Discussion: Lindsey Brandt
2025 Applications

Ms. Donahue summarized that a total of 50 applications were received since re-opening in 2024 and that the Committee will be down to three active applications after this meeting. She reiterated that the initial denial rate is around 95%, as only two applications have been recommended for approval. The last few applications have some sort of connection to AI.

Ms. Brandt gave an overview of the application from Villar Law, noting that they currently appear to provide immigration services along with other services. They also seek to utilize non-lawyer providers, which lacks a plausible connection to future regulatory reform under the Court's Phase 3 directive. Additionally, it does not seem that this applicant has a Utah-specific model.

Mr. Chambers motioned to move to closed session. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion, and the Committee closed the meeting.

Ms. Donahue added an informational item that a fee request was received right before the application cut off. There is no policy allowing waivers of the application fee.

5. Post-Closed Session

Ms. Brandt moved to deny the application from Villar Law on the following grounds: 1) they appear to be a for-profit immigration firm, 2) there appears to be non-lawyer providers, 3) it is unclear whether there is a Utah-specific model, and 4) there is problematic representation on their website. Mr. Chambers seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Brandt motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Farnsworth seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned.