

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Utah Supreme Court’s Ad Hoc Committee on Regulatory Reform**  
**AI/Legal Tech Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2026**  
**12:00 – 1:00**  
**Virtual**

---

The group approved the minutes from the previous meeting.

The group discussed minor revisions to be made to the draft interim report to the Utah Supreme Court.

- The group also discussed examples in the report involving entities that utilize a compliance attorney subject to OPC oversight, and noted the need to clarify that there has never been a compliance attorney requirement in the Sandbox.
- These edits were identified as clarifications to improve accuracy in describing how the Sandbox evolved.

Representatives from the Utah Office of Artificial Intelligence Policy (Zach Boyd, Brady Young, and Cam Bronson) joined the meeting to discuss the Office’s work and potential areas of coordination with the Committee

- The Office’s role is to help the State of Utah remain nimble in developing policy approaches to artificial intelligence (AI).
- The office operates with two primary statutory mandates:
  1. Serve as a “learning laboratory,” collaborating with academics, businesses, and policymakers to evaluate emerging AI technologies and identify areas where policy guidance may benefit Utah residents.
  2. To provide regulatory mitigation or relief to companies deploying AI systems that may otherwise face legal or regulatory barriers. In these situations, the Office may enter into agreements with companies that create limited carve-outs from enforcement, subject to defined safeguards and conditions. These agreements specify what the company is permitted to do and establish guardrails to protect consumers.
- Several key discussion points included:
  - Safeguards and reporting requirements. These requirements are developed on a case-by-case basis depending the nature of the technology. In the case of Eliza Chat, a mental-health chatbot meant to assist high school students, reporting has focused on evaluating the effectiveness of guardrails and identifying areas where adjustments may be needed. Reporting may include safety, efficacy, and equity metrics.

- Data protection and privacy. These particular safeguards are important for systems involving medical information. The Office explained that companies operating in healthcare contexts must comply with applicable laws, such as HIPAA. These safeguards are built into agreements where necessary.
- Consumer complaints and enforcement. The Office explained that agreements include provisions allowing complaints to be directed to the Office of Consumer Protection and that enforcement may occur through termination of the agreement if safeguards are violated. In some cases, companies may be given a cure period to address compliance issues. The Office noted that it invests significant effort in vetting companies and building working relationships before allowing them to participate.
- Staff and resources. The office currently operates with five full-time staff members and has been active for approximately one and a half years under an initial three-year authorization. While the Office has statutory authority to collect registration fees, it has not implemented a fee structure at this stage because the cost of building such a system has not yet been justified by the scale of activity.

Following the presentation from the Office of AI Policy, the group discussed potential ways to incorporate insights from the Office and how to collaborate in the future.

- Members also discussed the importance of technical expertise in AI oversight. The group noted that some AI policy work at the state level involves individuals with specialized technical training, and suggested that similar expertise could be valuable in any future regulatory framework involving AI and legal services.

The workgroup agreed to continue refining the interim report collaboratively. A shared document will be circulated to the workgroup to allow members to suggest revisions and comments. The full workgroup plans to reconvene in approximately three weeks to continue discussion and review the updated draft.