

**Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes of the July 30, 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 MDT on July 30, 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	
Sophia Goss, Judge Lipinsky's summer extern	X	

I. Approval of minutes of the June 25 meeting.

A member made a motion, which another member seconded, to approve the June 25 meeting minutes. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes. One member abstained from voting due to absence.

II. Report on the latest draft of the consolidated document.

The Committee discussed the current version of the consolidated guidance document, which includes the most recent revisions to reduce overlap and improve coherence. Magistrate Ward, Professor Siebecker, Professor Kaminski, and Julia Martinez revised their respective chapters.

The next steps will focus on ensuring that the document has a consistent style and tone.

III. Issues to discuss and resolve.

A. Document Length.

The Committee will continue to shorten the document. The Committee noted that the optimal length would be between thirty-six and fifty pages; the document is currently seventy pages. Professor Kaminski noted that sections 1 and 2 are too long. She will significantly trim and reorder them.

B. Necessary and Unnecessary Repetition.

As previously discussed, the Committee would like users to read the entire document but understands that many will not do so. For this reason, there will be some necessary repetition, and each chapter should stand alone as much as possible.

One member noted that the language that previously appeared in the separate chapter on legal professionals was distributed throughout the document to minimize repetition.

A member suggested beginning the document with a discussion of rules and responsibilities, followed by the technical details, to better engage readers. The first part should begin with an explanation of why a basic understanding of AI matters. The document should be framed toward users rather than developers.

The separate risk section was removed. The Committee agreed that the document should not emphasize the risk of use of AI tools and should begin by explaining their benefits.

One member noted that there could be a “too long, didn’t read” version containing hyperlinks to specific sections. The Committee agreed with this idea. Once the text is complete, Damien Riehl will create a summary — like a table of contents — with bullet points and hyperlinks.

C. Tone.

The Committee acknowledged the inconsistencies in the document’s tone and voice due to multiple contributors focusing on their own chapters. Judge Lipinsky and Matt Knaster volunteered to review and harmonize the tone in the next set of edits and to circulate a new draft by August 12.

D. Guiding Principles.

The Committee discussed the guiding principles section of the document and an appropriate approach with which the Supreme Court would be comfortable. The Supreme Court will be the institutional author of the document and likely would not believe it was appropriate to include policy recommendations. The Committee discussed whether the principles should include normative concepts such as justice or instead focus on access to justice and other practical principles. Nonetheless, the Committee agreed that the document should reflect principles with which all judges could agree, such as competence, access, integrity, transparency, confidentiality, equality, and respect.

Professor Siebecker offered to revise the preamble to make it more concise and neutral. The Committee discussed drafting a separate transmittal memo to the Supreme Court that could incorporate much of the current version of the guiding principles section.

A member suggested a roadmap section to clarify the document's purpose and structure.

E. Technical Detail.

Professor Kaminski will revise the technical section.

F. Recommendations for Self-Represented Parties.

There will be two versions of the text regarding self-represented parties — the comprehensive, professionally drafted chapter in the guideline document and a standalone document written at a fifth-grade reading level.

G. Citations.

The final product will need appropriate citations. The research subcommittee and the law clerks will assist with this.

H. Reader Navigation.

As noted above, Damien Riehl will prepare a summary with bullet points and hyperlinks.

The Committee discussed ways to improve reader navigation through the document, which will appear in online and print versions. Suggestions included using hyperlinks, paragraph numbering, and bullet-pointed summaries of action items, with the goal of making the document user-friendly for diverse audiences, including self-represented parties.

I. Index.

Damien Riehl will create an index once the remainder of the document has been completed.

J. Transmittal memo to the Supreme Court.

Professor Siebecker will draft a transmittal memo.

IV. Next steps.

- A. By July 31, Professor Kaminski will revise parts 1 and 2, as discussed above; Professor Siebecker will revise the principles; and Julia Martinez will edit the rules section. Colin Moriarty will incorporate those edits into the synthesized document by August 1.
- B. August 12 — Judge Lipinsky and Matt Knaster will edit the document, with assistance from Justice Berkenkotter’s law clerks.
- C. August 28 — The members of the Committee will provide comments on the new draft. Comments must be specific, propose concrete revisions, and avoid wordsmithing. The Committee will use a “traffic light” system — red light signifies a critical concern, and a yellow light signifies a recommendation.
- D. September 4 at noon — The Committee scheduled a meeting on this date to review the revised document.
- E. September 28 — Judge Guillon and Julia Martinez (the final editors) will submit their suggested edits. Colin Moriarty will continue to coordinate the edits to the document.
- F. October 1 at noon — This will be the final meeting of the Advisory Committee before the deadline to submit the guideline document to the Chief Justice. The Committee will not meet on September 17.
- G. Once the Committee reaches agreement on the document text, Damien Riehl will create the annotated table of contents and index. Justice Berkenkotter and Judge Lipinsky will work with a state graphics professional on the document’s design.
- H. October 15 — Justice Berkenkotter will ask the Chief Justice whether the Committee may have a two-week extension to submit the final version of the guideline document.

V. New business.

There was no new business.

VI. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary