

**Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes of the June 25, 2026, Meeting**

A quorum being present, the Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Judge Lino S. Lipinsky de Orlov at noon MST on June 25, 2026, in the Court of Appeals' Full Court Conference Room. The attendees at the meeting were:

Committee Members:	Present	Not Present
The Honorable Lino S. Lipinsky de Orlov, Chair	X	
Katina Banks, Esq.	X	
The Honorable Jill Dorancy	X	
The Honorable Stacy Guillon	X	
April Jones, Esq.	X	
Professor Margot Kaminski		X
Lois Lupica, Esq.		X
Julia Martinez, Esq.		X
Colin Moriarty, Esq.	X	
Damien Riehl, Esq.		X
Professor Michael Siebecker		X
The Honorable Thomas Ward		X
Non-Voting Participants:		
The Honorable Maria E. Berkenkotter, Liaison Justice	X	
Kathryn Michaels, Supreme Court Staff Attorney	X	
Justin Jin, Law Clerk	X	
Nick Ballou, Law Student		X
Amy Schubert-Zhang, Law Student		X
Kelley Oldberg, Counsel to the Office of the Chief Justice	X	
Guests:		
Matt Knaster, an associate who works with Colin Moriarty	X	
Clarisa Huang, Judge Lipinsky's summer extern	X	
Sophia Goss, Judge Lipinsky's summer extern	X	
Suzanne Karrer, Senior Manager Communications (Chief Communications Officer for the judicial branch)		X

I. Approval of Minutes of the May 28 Meeting.

A member made a motion, which another member seconded, to approve the May 28 meeting minutes. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

II. Editing and Commenting on the Draft Guideline Document.

A. General Thoughts.

Judge Lipinsky thanked Colin Moriarty and Damien Riehl for assembling the first draft of the consolidated document. In an email, Professor Siebecker suggested that the draft is overly long and repetitive. A member agreed and suggested that the subcommittees could reduce repetition by making their chapters more specific. Factual assertions will need to be supported with citations, although the committee hopes to avoid embedding footnotes throughout the guidelines to avoid creating an overly complex document that is difficult to read. The research team should ensure the accuracy of the factual assertions and that the document includes appropriate citations.

B. Specific Questions and Comments.

1. Length of the Guideline Document and Authorial Voice.

One member suggested the use of an AI tool to knit together the chapters and make the document sound like the work of a single author. Subcommittees should reduce the length of their section by twenty percent. After all subcommittees have submitted their shortened chapters, one or two members should review the document for stylistic consistency.

To ensure that the committee meets the October 1 deadline for submitting the guideline document, anyone providing a comment should suggest a solution. Committee members should avoid wordsmithing.

Judge Lipinsky and Matt agreed to review the draft of the document by August 7, with assistance from Justice Berkenkotter's law clerks.

2. Unnecessary Repetition.

Committee members suggested that the subcommittees should review their chapters for repetition and highlight differentiating concepts that should remain in the document. One member suggested that the readers may read the chapters separately and, therefore, some repetition may be necessary and appropriate.

3. Fact Checking.

One member noted that all factual assertions should be supported by citations. The committee agreed that, although the final document does not need to contain a footnote for every factual assertion, the document should point to sources to which readers can turn if they have questions.

4. Tone.

The guidelines should have a neutral, objective tone and should not contain policy recommendations, as the final version will be promulgated as a Colorado Supreme Court document. Nonetheless, after the committee has submitted the guideline document, the committee can consider policy recommendations for transmission to the Court.

5. Structure.

The committee members discussed the importance of setting out guiding principles at the beginning of the document, possibly in an executive summary. Damien will assist in creating an index. The committee agreed that the document would not need a glossary, although it could cite a reliable one. The research team will look into existing AI glossaries. There will be no need for an FAQ section.

6. Gaps.

The committee members considered whether the draft is missing any substantive areas. Committee members noted that the transformation section would be an appropriation location for discussion of risks of AI use and providing illustrative user stories.

The guidelines should emphasize the need for training. CBA-CLE will take the lead in providing AI education for the state's legal professionals, including hands-on training with table exercises. Historically, CBA-CLE has not offered programs geared toward judges. The judicial branch will be responsible for training state judicial officers about AI. Mr. Moriarty will reach out to Ms. Jones regarding areas of the guidelines in which training should be highlighted.

III. Colorado Bar Association AI Task Force Report.

The committee briefly reviewed the CBA AI Task Force report, noting that it contains policy-oriented recommendations, such as billing structure changes, that are not appropriate in the guidelines. The AI Task Force plans to coordinate with the Standing Committee on the Rules of Professional Conduct regarding possible additional AI-related amendments to the Rules. Members noted the importance that the Supreme Court and the Task Force produce consistent guidance materials for Colorado legal professionals. Members of the bar may be confused if presented with two parallel guideline documents.

IV. Copyright Issues.

Judge Lipinsky addressed the question raised at the committee's last meeting regarding whether the state or Lexis/Nexis has asserted copyright claims to the Colorado Revised Statutes or annotations.

Section 2-5-115 of the Colorado Revised Statutes provides that “[t]he committee, or its designee, may register a copyright for and in behalf of the state of Colorado in any and all original publications and editorial work ancillary to the Colorado Revised Statutes that are prepared by the general assembly or its staff.” The Colorado Supreme Court librarians have determined that the General Assembly and Lexis/Nexis (which is the contractor responsible for the Colorado statutory website) have not sought to register copyrights for the state’s statutory materials.

V. Next Steps and Deadlines.

Members agreed on the following key deadlines:

July 17 — The subcommittees will circulate edited and shortened versions of their respective chapters of the draft consolidated document. The subcommittees will reduce the length of their chapters by twenty percent each.

July 17 — Professor Siebecker will complete the universal principles and key recommendations sections.

August 7 — Judge Lipinsky and Matt Knaster will edit the entire document, with assistance from Justice Berkenkotter’s law clerks.

August 28 — The members of the Advisory Committee will provide comments on the new draft, which will be in Word format. Comments must be specific, should propose concrete revisions, and should avoid wordsmithing.

Before September 17 — Judge Guillon and Julia Martinez (our final editors) will submit their suggested edits to the entire document.

Noon on September 17 — This will be the final meeting of the Advisory Committee before the October 1 deadline for submitting the guideline document to the Chief Justice. *Please note that the date of this meeting has changed. The Committee will not meet on September 10.*

Once we complete the document text — Damien Riehl will prepare an index and state personnel will complete the document’s graphic design.

October 1 — This is our deadline to submit the finished version of the guideline document to the Chief Justice.

VI. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary