

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **Utah Supreme Court's Ad Hoc Committee on Regulatory Reform**

**Nick Stiles, Co-Chair, Maryt Fredrickson, Co-Chair**

#### **Kick Off Meeting Minutes**

**May 23, 2025, 12:00 – 1:00**

**Virtual & In-person**

---

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Nick Stiles opened the meeting with welcome remarks. Both co-chairs introduced themselves followed by introductions from all committee members.

#### **2. Innovation Office and Sandbox Refresher**

The group went over a brief historical review of the Legal Services Innovation (LSI) Office and Sandbox. Andrea discussed Phase 2 of the Sandbox, what the LSI committee has been busy working on, and the current state of the sandbox.

#### **3. Ad Hoc Committee on Regulatory Reform Charge**

The cochairs introduced the charges for each working group, set by the supreme court and outlined in the meeting materials. The purpose of large group meetings, with all of the working groups, is to share the work of other committees, identify overlaps, and see how each group's work interfaces and coordinate efforts accordingly.

#### **4. Four Workgroups**

The four working groups were introduced. This effort is focused on Utah, but as a national leader in regulatory reform efforts, the final report that comes from this committee is likely to be widely shared and studied around the country. Committee members are invited at any time to flag that we are missing other stakeholder who should be invited. Additional topics or questions that have

been overlooked in the charges for the workgroups are also welcome. There was some discussion on the term “best practices” used in some of the charges and whether to use a different term.

Jon Wayas and Emily Lee introduced the LPP program. It launched in 2019, after Washington launched its LLLT (aka, triple L-T) program in 2015. Washington’s program later ended. Utah’s continued and Jon shared the current numbers of LPPs and the number of applicants taking the LPP exam this season. The exam is twice a year.

Hayley Cousin and Judge Mrazik introduced the Community Justice Advocates of Utah program. Hayley noted this is a high turnover environment. In Utah, the hosting entity (CJAU) develops and conducts the training.

## **5. Schedule/Timeline**

The committee has roughly a year to meet and will meet monthly. The preliminary plan is to spend the first 6 months’ work on gathering research, discussing, and hosting guest speakers. By November 2025, the working groups will start assembling a preliminary report and recommendation to present to the Supreme Court for preliminary feedback. After hearing any feedback, the working groups will continue working until about August 2026 towards completed recommendations and a final report. The meetings will be hybrid or virtual.

There was some discussion of whether the CJA and LLP groups should meet together. The AI group may likewise have some overlap with other groups and need to jointly meet at different points. Andrea noted that other entities in the Sandbox may need to be included and noted that a couple of Sandbox entities do not fit neatly into any of the four working groups, so the input from those entities when considering a post-Sandbox landscape should not be overlooked.

Judge Mrazik noted the value of the large group meetings and suggested they be more frequent, even if just with a representative from each working group. Some discussion followed on the pro and cons of large groups and small groups where the turnaround time for recommendations is relatively short.

Doodle polls will follow to get meeting times for each workgroup. The AI and 5.4 groups will meet jointly to start to see where there may be overlaps and areas for coordination.