PA Compact Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2025

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Tim Terranova	Chair	X	Joined meeting at 3:14 p.m.
Marisa Courtney	Vice-Chair	X	X
Jamie Alley	Secretary	X	X
Larry Marx	Treasurer	X	
Elizabeth Huntley	Executive At Large	X	X
Justin Hepner	Executive At Large	X	X
Paula Martinez	Executive At Large	X	
	Total voting members present		5/7
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	Agenda	Approve 8/13 Minutes	Approve RFP
Tim Terranova			n/a
Marisa Courtney			n/a
Jamie Alley		1	n/a
Larry Marx			n/a
Elizabeth Huntley	1		n/a
Justin Hepner	2	2	n/a
Paula Martinez			n/a

Call to Order

Marisa Courtney serves as acting chair in Chair Terranova's absence. Chair Courtney calls the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. ET

Roll Call
A. Mortell calls roll. Chair Terranova joins meeting at 3:14 p.m.

Review and Adopt Agenda
Committee reviews agenda.
<u>Motion</u>:

- Elizabeth Huntley motions to adopt agenda.
- Justin Hepner seconds motion.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Review and Approve Draft Minutes
Committee reviews minutes and has no edits.
<u>Motion:</u>

- Jamie Alley motions to adopt draft minutes from 8/13/25.
- Justin Hepner seconds motion.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Legislative Update
C. Sims gives legislative update. Active legislation can also be seen on the map on the PA Website: https://www.pacompact.org/#compact

Three states with active legislation: MI, MA, and NJ. There has been no legislative activity in those states since the last meeting. Other compact legislation has been moving in MI, so it is possible we will see the PA Compact move through committee soon also.

Committee Reports
Finance –

- Did not meet since last Executive Committee meeting.

Communications – met on September 4, 2025

- J. Hepner: Committee reviewed FAQs from the compact website.
- G. Thomas: The newsletter was approved in its current form and will be posted on the website. There was discussion about AAPA and NCCPA providing a link to the newsletter.
- A. Mortell: FSMB is working on posting the newsletter on the webpage. Once that is complete, I will provide the link to Greg and Kathy for NCCPA and AAPA to disseminate.

Rules – met on August 25, 2025

- J. Alley: The committee worked on the data system rule, and the rule on privilege process is close to finished. The committee plans to approve it for Executive Committee review during their next meeting.

AAPA Conference Booth Update

- A. Mortell: After discussing the matter with Chairs Terranova and Courtney, there will be a PA Compact booth next to the AAPA booth. This will allow the AAPA staff to help man the commission booth if commission members are not available during the whole event, and the booth will be up for the entirety of the event rather than just the exhibition hall.
- K. Scarbalis: This option also comes at no cost to the commission.

Data System RFP Discussion with U.S. Digital Response

- C. Sims introduces Waldo Jaquith from U.S. Digital Response who has helped other commissions in their RFP development and can provide support and answer questions regarding best practices when selecting a software vendor.
- W. Jaquith provides background on U.S. Digital Response as a grant-funded non-profit. U.S. Digital Response and their employees provide support to government and government-adjacent organizations.
- W. Jaquith: What questions do you have regarding the data system RFP process?
    - K. Scarbalis: How is our RFP different than other RFPs, and is there anything we can do to make it better?
    - W. Jaquith: It is good that the RFP does not contain many pages of requirements since doing so usually eliminates any available software based on what vendors currently offer. One thing I am concerned about is it seems to be in between wanting to build a system and wanting an existing system, but you must choose one. Customizing an existing system is a bad investment as you do not own the system you are investing in tailoring to your needs. Also, vendors determine what RFPs they will respond to based on the requested programming language, cloud environment, etc., including and particularly the size of the contract. It is unclear for the amount proposed in the RFP what the deliverable would be by the end of it.
- Chair Courtney: What would you suggest we choose between the two options?
    - W. Jaquith: I always want people to buy off the shelf software when there is a competitive market offering good quality software that are widely in use, as custom systems are expensive and the responsibility of maintaining them is completely that of the owner. However, the market assessment I helped conduct with CSG two years ago revealed there were not many good options available. Software quality was too low, or the price tag too high, and/or I did not trust the vendor.
- C. Sims: The $150,000 listed in the RFP reflects the budget the commission previously dedicated to the data system; however, with the fiscal year ending on September 30, the Finance Committee will be looking at the FY26 budget. There could be room for adding more funds to the data system and listing it in the RFP if that was desired.
- W. Jaquith: A rule of thumb is you are going to pay for a good vendor at $125/hr for one person, which will be about $150,000 a year.
- N. Kalfas: Given the financial realities of this commission, there is potential for responses to this RFP from commissions who have existing data systems that could be tailored to this commission's needs. Do you have guidance on those RFP respondents?
    - W. Jaquith: I would require code audits and automated tests, and I would want to see that at least 90% of the lines of code have test coverage. Have them tell you about their vendor and developer. If the system was created for one commission, it is difficult to

move the system from serving one commission to two, compared to for example five to six. It is important to have someone who can inspect the software for its suitability for your specific purposes. I would want to see a high level of quality that is typical of software used among those in the private sector.

- N. Kalfas: Who would serve as a code auditor, what are the costs, what does that process look like?
  - W. Jaquith: This is not a standard service offered by vendors. I caution you that there is a claimed standard service called independent verification and validation, which does everything but look at the code. A vendor would likely agree to review the code for a fee in addition to the development contract. How thorough they are is dependent on the budget you have. U.S. Digital Response could possibly offer that service depending on your needs. Previously U.S. Digital Response provided volunteers to CSG to conduct a review, one of which was an experienced software developer.
- Chair Courtney proposes reassessing the RFP, particularly regarding the possibility of increasing the budget, and not approving it for distribution at this time.
  - J. Alley: I do not have a problem with that since we want to get this right. I am concerned we have a hybrid model that no developers will know what to do with.
  - W. Jaquith: There are companies who have software you could license, and then there are custom software development companies. But it strikes me as unlikely there will be a company who is also willing to work in a high-quality way of customizing the existing software for you.
  - Chair Courtney: So we would need to revisit the RFP in terms of choosing the exact route we want to go?
  - W. Jaquith: That would be my recommendation.
- N. Kalfas to W. Jaquith: Did you have comments on the RFP?
  - W. Jaquith: I have high-level comments, but if it would be helpful, I can thoroughly review and markup the RFP with my comments and send it back to the committee.
  - Committee confirms they would like that feedback.
  - W. Jaquith: I can work on that during the week of Sept. 22.
- G. Thomas: Regarding the financial aspect of this, next week the Finance Committee will discuss the possibility of increasing the data system budget, but it may not be possible to make an informed estimate without first reviewing RFP submissions.
- Committee decides to continue reviewing the RFP, including what additional funding is available, in addition to making a definite choice regarding the format of the software. The committee will also review W. Jaquith's notes.

Annual Commission Meeting Discussion

Chair Courtney opens the discussion on scheduling the next annual commission meeting.

- A. Mortell: FSMB reached out asking if the commission would like to utilize the same space as last April during their next annual meeting, which prompted the need for a discussion regarding when annual meetings will occur going forward and whether they will be in person.
- Chair Terranova: It is probably better to have an annual meeting in August or September because of the budget. An additional meeting can be called, but a standard meeting should be established in Aug. or Sept. to approve the budgets prior to the end of the fiscal year. The

commission does need to meet sooner than next April to approve the FY26 budget. Depending on the Rules Committee's progress, it would be good to also approve rule 1 during that full commission meeting as well.

- Chair Terranova: I think the budget approval meeting would certainly be virtual. A question for the committee would be do we need in-person meetings? It is nice to see our fellow commissioners, but given our budget, is it necessary?
    - E. Huntley: I agree it is nice but not necessary particularly given our budget currently.
    - Chair Courtney: Not funding an in-person meeting seems like the right choice given the budget constraints and the desire to increase the money allocated to the data system development.
    - N. Kalfas: Several other commissions have policies in place that say we will have an in-person annual meeting if that is possible, which will be hybrid, and we will only provide coverage for expenses if the budget allows. They also purposely co-located and scheduled their full commission meetings during events that commissioners were already attending, so you do have that option. Looking at our funding agreements, there is nothing punitive for not having the budget approved by a certain time, but for the sake of good governance, not having the next budget approved by the end of the previous fiscal year is not good practice and something the committee is right in wanting to correct going forward.

Delegate Questions and Comments

- J. Hepner: Do we need to set aside time to discuss the RFP again?
    - Chair Courtney: Most likely we will wait until we have received W. Jaquith's comments, which the chair will review and present to the committee again at the next meeting in October.

Public Questions and Comments

None.

Adjourn

Hearing no further business or discussion, Chair Courtney adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m. ET.