



PA Compact Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

October 8, 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

7/7

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

Name	Non-Member Role	Attendance
Nahale Kalfas	Interim Legal Counsel	X
Carl Sims	Interim Staff Support	X
Abigail Mortell	Interim Executive Director	X

Name	Approve Amended Agenda	Approve 9/10 Minutes	Approve FY26 Draft Budget	Ratify Full Commission Meeting Date	Approve RFP and delegate creation of an appendix to Chair and commission staff
Tim Terranova					
Marisa Courtney		2	2	1	
Jamie Alley					2
Larry Marx	1	1	1	2	1
Elizabeth Huntley	2				
Justin Hepner					
Paula Martinez					

5
6 **Call to Order**

7 Chair Terranova calls the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. ET
8

9 **Roll Call**

10 A. Mortell calls roll.
11

12 **Review and Adopt Amended Agenda**

13 Committee reviews agenda.

14 **Motion:**

- 15 • Larry Marx motions to adopt the amended agenda.
16 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds motion.
17 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.
18

19 **Review and Approve Draft Minutes**

20 Committee reviews minutes and has no edits.

21 **Motion:**

- 22 • Larry Marx motions to adopt draft minutes from 9/10/25.
23 • Marisa Courtney seconds motion.
24 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.
25

26 **Legislative Update**

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

28 <https://www.pacompact.org/#compact>
29

30 Three states with active legislation: MI, MA, and NJ. There have been no changes to the pending
31 legislation in those states since the last meeting. MI has adopted their budget, which appeared to be
32 holding up other legislation filed there, and movement has been seen there with other compact
33 legislation since, with more hearings possibly to come. Commission staff will soon be meeting with AAPA
34 and NCCPA for a legislative planning session for 2026.
35

36 **Committee Reports and Review and Approval of FY26 Draft Budget**

37 Finance – met September 15, 2025

- 38 • L. Marx provides an overview of the FY25 actual costs and proposed draft budget for FY26.
39 • J. Hepner asks if the commission expects that primary revenue will come from privilege fees in
40 the future.
41 ○ L. Marx explains the commission has not yet discussed what the commission fee and
42 state fee will be for each privilege, but that is a discussion that will be necessary as the
43 commission gets closer to compact activation. Hopefully those fees can be set with
44 consideration given to the salaries of PAs.
45 • J. Hepner asks what percentage of practicing PAs currently work in more than one state?
46 ○ G. Thomas explains that FSMB would have that data since NCCPA does not collect
47 licensing data.

- K. Scarbalis notes that PAs who have licenses in more than one state may decide to not join the compact for a variety of reasons.
- J. Hepner adds that knowing how many PAs are in the U.S. and how many practice in multiple states could inform how many PAs will eventually utilize the compact and purchase privileges.
- K. Scarbalis notes that AAPA and NCCPA are aware that it may be necessary for both organizations to continue providing funding to the commission even after privileges are being issued.
- L. Marx asks if G. Thomas or K. Scarbalis know how many PAs there are in the U.S.
 - G. Thomas: At the beginning of 2025 there were around 190,000, and last year there was a record of 11,000 newly certified PAs. It will likely be over 200,000 by the end of the year, if not already.
 - K. Scarbalis confirms those figures.
- In response to J. Hepner's question regarding privilege fees, C. Sims provides context regarding privilege fees. Funding is an evolving conversation within other commissions as they have operationalized and identified the need for other funding sources in addition to privilege fees. While all privileges come with a commission fee and potentially a state fee, the need for other sources of revenue may fluctuate in relation to the degree to which practitioners are utilizing the compact. This commission can also look to what other commissions have done with regard to commission fees.
- J. Alley recalls a figure previously shared that compact participation is at or below 20% of a profession.
 - N. Kalfas explains that statistical percentages come from data known about IMLC. It is reasonable to expect that degree of participation.
 - J. Alley: It is anticipated that maximum participation would be 25% out of roughly 200,000 potentially eligible practitioners, though some who are certified are not licensed and others are retired, etc. Long term planning for funding that does not solely rely on the privilege fees is likely necessary.
 - N. Kalfas: CSG has gathered information for other commissions regarding commission funding information, which showed that IMLC is an anomaly in self-funding long-term. Otherwise, other commissions receive on-going support.

Motion:

- Larry Marx motions to approve the draft budget for FY26.
- Marisa Courtney seconds motion.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Communications – has not met since the last Executive Committee meeting.

Rules – has not met since the last Executive Committee meeting.

Ratification of Full Commission Meeting Date

- Chair Terranova explains the need to call a special full commission meeting on Monday, November 3, 2025. The meeting will have two items: approve the minutes from the previous full commission meeting and adopt the budget for fiscal year 2026.

92
93 **Motion:**

- 94 • Marisa Courtney motions to ratify the setting of the full commission meeting for Monday,
95 November 3, 2025, at 1pm ET.
- 96 • Larry Marx seconds motion.
- 97 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

98
99 **AAPA and NCCPA Funding Letters Update**

- 100 • Chair Terranova updates the committee that letters requesting continued financial support in
101 accordance with the commission's funding agreement have been sent to NCCPA and AAPA.
- 102 • J. Alley asks if the annual report mentioned in the letters could be shared with the committee.
- 103 • Chair Terranova confirms that the annual report will be shared with the committee, which
104 contains much of the same information included in the commission's first newsletter.

105
106 **PA Compact Website Domain Migration**

- 107 • A. Mortell updates the committee that migrating the PA Compact website domain from .org to
108 .gov requires an application that includes designating a senior official (ED can serve as this) and
109 domain managers (likely IT partners at FSMB). IT partners at FSMB are looking into the process
110 further and will provide an update when the application can be initiated.

111
112 **Data System RFP Discussion**

- 113 • Chair Terranova opens discussion on data system RFP and Waldo Jaquith's comments.
- 114 • J. Alley asks if it would be confusing to not include the term "physician associate" since it
115 appears in reference to AAPA.
 - 116 ○ G. Thomas explains that NCCPA uses "physician assistant/associate (PA)" with all
117 subsequent mentions being to "PA," and agrees that omitting "associate" would create
118 unnecessary confusion.
 - 119 ○ Chair Terranova notes that Waldo commented that "PA" should be spelled out since the
120 readers may not be familiar with the profession, but the RFP can reflect the committee's
121 preference.
 - 122 ○ K. Scarbalis agrees with concerns but given the target audience will not be familiar with
123 PAs, including "associate" may not be necessary.
 - 124 ○ J. Alley specifies that the vendor may get confused by the mention of "associate" in
125 AAPA title. A drop footnote could be included to remedy this.
 - 126 ○ E. Huntley agrees with J. Alley and adds that how the commission refers to PAs clearly
127 and avoids confusion is something to consider more generally when preparing to
128 communicate with the public and profession.
 - 129 ○ Chair Terranova concludes a sentence can be added explaining that "PA as used in this
130 document means physician assistant and physician associate," to maintain the plain
131 language throughout the document.
- 132 • 1.2 Problem
 - 133 ○ No comments.
- 134 • 2.1 Product Vision
 - 135 ○ No comments.

- 136 • 2.2 Anticipated
- 137 ○ J. Alley asks if the committee is considering adding an appendix to explain where
- 138 additional funding would come from or keep the current language about where the
- 139 existing funding comes from and see if that is sufficient based on RFP responses.
- 140 ▪ N. Kalfas: Since the commission cannot list funding that is not yet secured, the
- 141 only real way to address Waldo's concerns would be to add an appendix that
- 142 lists potential revenue sources, the funding that is currently secured, and state
- 143 that the commission is available to discuss further.
- 144 ▪ C. Sims: The budget listed in the RFP would be viewed differently by a vendor
- 145 creating something from scratch versus something from existing software. Until
- 146 the committee receives responses to the RFP, we will not know exactly how
- 147 responders feel about the budget and how it is laid out presently.
- 148 ○ J. Alley asks if 4-9 people on the project is still an appropriate number?
- 149 ▪ C. Sims explains that number is an industry average for a scrum team and allows
- 150 for flexibility based on what the vendor may propose.
- 151 • 3.1 Backlog - State Licensing Officials/Administrator/Investigators User Stories
- 152 ○ J. Alley asks N. Kalfas if there are any issues with second bullet, "so I am aware of the
- 153 disciplinary histories of practitioners using the compact."
- 154 ○ N. Kalfas recommends removing that part of the sentence since the existence of
- 155 investigatory information does not necessarily equate to a disciplinary history.
- 156 ○ Chair Terranova suggests changing "so" statement to "so I can better protect patients."
- 157 ○ J. Alley suggests "so I can engage in appropriate follow-up."
- 158 ○ N. Kalfas and Chair Terranova agree with J. Alley's suggestion.
- 159 ○ E. Huntley asks if there is a problem regarding states that will not share the existence of
- 160 investigatory material.
- 161 ○ N. Kalfas confirms "appropriate follow-up" covers those states that cannot share
- 162 information.
- 163 • 3.1 Backlog – Physician Assistant User Stories
- 164 ○ No comments.
- 165 • 4.0 Contract Place of Performance and Contract Type
- 166 ○ Chair Terranova explains based on Waldo's comment that raising the NTE after a
- 167 contract has been issued is bad practice within government contracts, so that line has
- 168 been removed for clarity.
- 169 ▪ N. Kalfas does not believe Waldo's comment applies to the commission, but also
- 170 the line is not necessary to achieve the purpose of the RFP, so removing it
- 171 makes things clearer. Additionally, if an appendix is going to be added discussing
- 172 the funding situation, the line is superfluous.
- 173 • 5.1 Environment
- 174 ○ Chair Terranova explains the commission is not set on Azure as the cloud environment
- 175 for the data system, so removing the specific reference to it prevents limiting the
- 176 vendors.
- 177 ▪ No objections.

- J. Alley asks if the committee plans to edit the RFP to address Waldo's concern that the RFP was a hybrid and did not distinguish between requesting a newly built system or a system that utilizes existing software.
 - C. Sims: We could say more explicitly that we want a system that builds off or utilizes software that exists rather than a newly built system. Additionally, we do not specify open source, besides stating that if any part of the proposed system would be not open source to notify the committee, but that is something we could more clearly delineate as well.
 - J. Hepner agrees with wanting the RFP to be clear, but also thinks some ambiguity is acceptable to allow the experts to provide their take on the proposal.
 - J. Alley clarifies the RFP can be left as is if that is what the committee decides regarding Waldo's comment.
 - Chair Terranova confirms it is not explicitly stated in the RFP whether the commission wants a new system built or to use an existing system; however, it is unlikely that companies who would create a new system will respond due to the budget constraints.

Motion:

- Larry Marx motions to approve the RFP and delegate creation of an addendum to Chair and commission staff prior to distribution.
- Jamie Alley seconds motion.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Delegate Questions and Comments

- K. Scarbalis wishes the committee a Happy PA Week.
- N. Kalfas updates the committee that last week, one of the three commissions affiliated with CompactConnect, the Counseling Compact, went live and is selling privileges between Arizona and Minnesota. As of yesterday, 105 privileges have been issued. The ASLP and OT commissions will also go live soon.
- E. Huntley notes that over 40 of those privileges were issued on the first afternoon.
- N. Kalfas adds the vast majority are for Minnesota.

Public Questions and Comments

None.

Adjourn

Hearing no further business or discussion, Chair Courtney adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m. ET.