



## PA Compact Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

June 11, 2025

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Tim Terranova	Chair	X	x
Marisa Courtney	Vice-Chair	X	x
Jamie Alley	Secretary	X	x
Larry Marx	Treasurer	X	x
Elizabeth Huntley	Executive At Large	X	x
Justin Hepner	Executive At Large	X	x
Paula Martinez	Executive At Large	X	x

### Total voting members present

Greg Thomas	Ex-Officio – NCCPA		
Kathy Scarbalis	Ex-Officio – AAPA		x

Name	Non-Member Role	Attendance
Nahale Kalfas	Interim Legal Counsel	x
Carl Sims	Interim Staff Support	x
Jessica Thomas	Interim Executive Director	x

Name	Agenda	Approve 5/14 Minutes					
Tim Terranova							
Marisa Courtney		1					
Jamie Alley							
Larry Marx	1						
Elizabeth Huntley	2	2					
Justin Hepner							
Paula Martinez							

5 **Call to Order**

6 Chair Terranova called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. ET

8 **Roll Call**

9 J. Thomas called roll.

11 **Review and Adopt Agenda**

12 Committee reviews agenda. Chair Terranova mentions that he has a speaking opportunity he will inform  
13 the committee about during delegate comments.

14 **Motion:**

- 15 • Larry Marx motions to adopt agenda.
- 16 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds motion.
- 17 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

19 **Review and Approve Draft Minutes**

20 Committee reviews minutes and has no edits.

21 **Motion:**

- 22 • Marisa Courtney motions to adopt draft minutes from 5/14/25.
- 23 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds motion.
- 24 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

26 **Legislative Update**

27 C. Sims gives legislative update. Active legislation can also be seen on the map on the PA Website:

28 <https://www.pacompact.org/#compact>

30 Enacted States: 17 Member states including 4 in 2025: Arkansas, Kansas, Montana, Iowa

32 Active Legislation:

33 Connecticut – going to governor

34 Massachusetts – not expected to move

35 Michigan – In Senate, session lasts until end of year

36 New Jersey - In Senate, session lasts until end of year

37 New York - not expected to move

38 North Carolina – Added to Omnibus with IMLC, in Senate

39 Oregon - not expected to move

41 **Committee Reports**

42 Rules- Met last week. Working on drafts of data system and privilege process.

43 Communications- Next meeting to be scheduled.

44 Finance- No updates since full meeting.

47 **Insurance Update**

48 N. Kalfas – Commission is insured.

## Data System RFP Discussion

J. Thomas shared Data System RFP Considerations.

Committee discusses the first point, Agile vs. Waterfall

- N. Kalfas- Agile is more forgiving, you have the ability to shift. However, this means everything you want may not be in the contract to point to. Waterfall is more constraining.
- C. Sims- Agile allows for constant feedback with vendors, the contract is for time and expertise.
- L. Marx- Change orders are issues. Agile a better way to go, as things change you can adjust. There's constant testing and not spending money on what doesn't work.
- J. Hepner- Agile it is important to stay in touch with developers and review regularly
  - C. Sims- Would need a project management person in place too coordinate.
- J. Alley- Waterfall also requires contact. Could be a question with vendors and their experience.
- E. Huntley- Board uses waterfall with vendor, it has been the right choice. Does it have to be one or the other?
  - Yes, need to choose one for the contract and RFP.
- J. Hepner- Would like ability to pause the work and discuss.
  - C. Sims- Agile allows an exit to the contract instead of being a fixed fee.

Straw Poll- Split on Agile vs. Waterfall. Discussion continues.

- L. Marx- What is CSG's experience?
  - C. Sims- Social Work Compact didn't pick, they listed both on the RFP. Joint Commissions chose Agile. It's a learning process but has been beneficial to choose Agile. There are a lot of advantages to Agile as far as control over the process and feedback.
- J. Alley- Is there a cost difference?
  - Not sure about a true cost comparison. Waterfall has risk built into the cost. Agile you can change along the way.
- K. Scarbalis- Spoke with husband (software consultant) and he said very few people use Waterfall anymore. Agile is more flexible and current.
- M. Courtney- Agile saved board a lot of headache. People did not realize how much was involved in licensing and regulation. The check-ins a long the way were useful.
- L. Marx- The proprietary piece will be important for long term.
  - T. Terranova- The next discussion item will be proprietary vs. open source.

Committee discusses Open Source vs. Proprietary

- J. Thomas- Who owns open source code?
  - Open Source- would have open code but there would be restrictions on how code is used. It may not generate revenue but there would be benefits from cost reductions
  - N. Kalfas- With Open Source people can see and try to break the code constantly allowing for higher security.
- K. Scarbalis- Can you switch to open source if you start with proprietary?
  - No, with proprietary the company that develops it owns it. Unless it was in the contract that commission owns it, but that is not common.

Straw Poll 2

- Agile vs. Waterfall – Agile received most votes, Waterfall received none, some abstained from voting

- Open Source vs. Proprietary – Open Source received most votes, Proprietary received none, some abstained from voting

Next Steps-

Continue conversation points from Data System RFP Considerations

### **Delegate Questions and Comments**

Chair Terranova to speak at AAPA's LAS September 20, 2025. - Committee has no concerns with this speaking appearance.

### **Public Questions and Comments**

None

### **Adjourn**

Hearing no further business or discussion, Chair Terranova adjourned the meeting at 3:54 p.m. ET.

draft