



PA Compact Rules Committee Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2026

1
2

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Jamie Alley	WV Delegate	x	x
Susan Gile	KS Delegate	x	x
Lucy Treene	VA Alternate	x	
Valeska Barr	OK Delegate	x	
Elizabeth Huntley	MN Delegate	x	x
Stephanie Loucka	OH Delegate	x	x
Catherine Marie Patterson	TN Delegate	x	x
Larry Marx	UT Delegate	x	x Joined at 11:15am ET
Robert Sanders	WI Delegate	x	
Amber Houge	IA Delegate	x	x
Total voting members present		Quorum – 6/10	7/10
Marisa Courtney	Vice Chair PA Commission		
Kathy Scarbalis	Ex-Officio – AAPA		x
Tim Terranova	Chair PA Commission		x
Name	Non-Member Role		Attendance
Nahale Kalfas	Interim Legal Counsel		x
Abigail Mortell	Interim Executive Director		x
Carl Sims	CSG		x
Laura Monick	OH Alternate		x

3

VOTES			
Name	Agenda	Adopt Minutes from December 15, 2025	Approve Draft Rule 3 as amended
Jamie Alley			1
Valeska Barr			
Elizabeth Huntley	1	2	2
Stephanie Loucka			

Catherine Marie Patterson			
Larry Marx			
Robert Sanders			
Susan Gile	2	1	
Lucy Treene			
Amber Houge			
TOTALS	Motion passes	Motion passes	Motion passes

4 **Welcome**
5 **Call to order/Roll Call**

6
7 Chair Loucka calls meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. ET.
8 A. Mortell takes roll. 7/10 voting members present.
9

10 **Review and Adopt Agenda**

11 Committee reviews the agenda; Chair Loucka calls for a motion to adopt the agenda.

12 **Motion:**

- 13 • Elizabeth Huntley motions to adopt the agenda.
- 14 • Susan Gile seconds.
- 15 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

16
17 **Minutes from December 15, 2025**

18 Committee reviews the draft minutes. Chair Loucka calls for a motion to adopt minutes from
19 December 15, 2025.

20 **Motion:**

- 21 • Susan Gile motions to adopt December 15, 2025, minutes.
- 22 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds.
- 23 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

24
25 **Public Comments on Draft Rule 3 – Compact Privilege**

- 26 • Chair Loucka opens the discussion on the public comments on Draft Rule 3. The
27 committee received one set of comments from the Maine medical board.
 - 28 ○ Comment 1: “Reason for Rule – Add references to reason for rule, include a
29 reference to section 4 of the PA Compact model language.”
 - 30 ■ Chair Loucka does not think it would be necessary to add reference to
31 reason for rule since it is listed under the authority.

- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65
- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- N. Kalfas notes this addition could be delegated to staff as a non-substantive formatting change and would not require the rule be republished for public comment.
 - No objections to adding reference.
 - Comment 2: “Authority – Include a reference to the PA Compact Model Language and statutory enactments in member states.”
 - N. Kalfas notes this would not be considered a substantive change, but this change may not be necessary if at the beginning of the rule the committee adds that all references mentioned herein are to the model language and include a link.
 - Committee elects to add statement that all references are to the model language.
 - Comment 3: “Purpose – Include a reference to section 4 of the PA Compact Model Language.”
 - Chair Loucka notes this would be non-substantive and can be included similar to the Reason for Rule.
 - No objections to this change.
 - Comment 4: “Definitions – Consider adding a definition for “Unique Identifier” such as “*means a social security number issued by the United States Social Security Administration.*”
 - Chair Loucka notes this would be a substantive change.
 - J. Alley notes the term is used once in the rule where it reads “a unique identifier that is a social security number,” so defining it does not seem necessary particularly if it is the only substantive change that would necessitate another public comment period.
 - N. Kalfas agrees with not defining it at this point, but as the committee gets into data system development, “unique identifier” is a term that may mean something different within the data system. Many systems take the unique identifier and convert it to another identifier for security reasons. It may be necessary that the committee revises this rule or the rule on data system as the data system is developed.
 - Committee elects to maintain language as drafted.
 - Comment 5: “Delegation of compact privilege responsibilities – Consider changing the title to “Compact Privilege Administration” and remove references to delegation in the section. There may be legal issues surrounding the appearance of a state agency delegating the sovereign rights of a state to an outside agency. However, the rule can have the same meaning and effect by indicating that the compact commission has administrative responsibilities.”
 - N. Kalfas notes this would not be a substantive change. Change to “Participating states are deemed to have assigned to the Compact Commission...”
 - No objections to this change.
 - Comment 6: “Eligibility for compact privilege – Edit the first paragraph to read ‘A PA must meet the following requirements to receive *and maintain* a compact privilege under the terms and provisions of the Compact *and member state statutory enactments.*’”

- 78
- 79
- 80
- 81
- 82
- 83
- 84
- 85
- 86
- 87
- 88
- 89
- 90
- 91
- 92
- 93
- 94
- 95
- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- N. Kalfas would be concerned about adding “and member state statutory enactments” because it would require changes elsewhere to begin adding that reference.
 - L. Monick thinks with the change to add at the beginning of the rule that references are to the model language will help with this area.
 - No objections to adding only the suggested “*and maintain*,” which would not be substantive per N. Kalfas.
 - Comment 7: “Compact participation process – Add ‘Model Legislation’ at the end of the first sentence of 3.4.(a).3.”
 - Committee considers this implicit and change unnecessary.
 - Comment 8: “Compact participation process, 3.4.(a).5 – In BOLIM’s opinion this attestation should be for pending investigations in any state, not just a qualifying state.”
 - L. Monick: Having pending investigations is not an eligibility requirement to participate in the compact. There was previous discussion around what participants must attest to, and the committee determined it to be investigations for the qualifying license since that is required for compact participation and discipline would affect it.
 - J. Alley asks N. Kalfas for her perspective on the proposed change and whether it is possible under the compact.
 - N. Kalfas notes it is a grey area and agrees with L. Monick’s explanation for why the committee drafted it this way.
 - Chair Loucka concludes this change is not possible under the compact.
 - Comment 9: “Consider adding ‘under the criteria set forth in Section 4 of the PA Compact Model Legislation.’ at the end of the sentence in 3.4.(b).1.”
 - Chair Loucka appreciates this change particularly based on IMLC.
 - N. Kalfas notes it would be non-substantive.
 - No objections to adding this change.
 - Comment 10: “3.4(e) – Consider changing ‘distributed’ to ‘accessible.’ Distributed means the commission has a duty to push the information out to all states. Participating states where the applicant is not requesting a privilege may not want the information forwarded to them.”
 - Chair Loucka notes that this was discussed with respect to the data system rule.
 - J. Alley confirms it was regarding the data system rule and the committee landed in a place like what this change suggests.
 - N. Kalfas notes it would not be a substantive change. Rather, it is procedural.
 - No objections to making this change.
 - Comment 11: “3.5 Compact privilege cycle and continued participation – Does the first sentence of (a) conflict with the automatic termination of qualification? Would it be clearer to add ‘or they have been determined not to be eligible’ at the end of the first sentence?”
 - L. Monick notes this language comes from Sec. 7.E.3.b of the compact model language.
 - Committee chooses to leave language as drafted.

- 124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
- Comment 11: “3.6 Voluntary termination of a qualifying license – consider changing (a) to read ‘If the PA voluntarily terminates their qualifying license through which they applied for their current compact privilege(s) and that qualifying license has not yet expired, the voluntary termination ends their licensure in the SQL and terminates all compact privileges as of the date of termination, unless the PA selects a new state of qualifying license prior to terminating the current qualifying license by following this process.’”
 - N. Kalfas notes this would not be substantive. The committee should consider which version gives best direction to administrators.
 - Chair Loucka considers this language clearer.
 - E. Huntley and J. Alley like proposed language.
 - No objections from committee to incorporating proposed language.
 - Comment 12: “3.9 Denial or withdrawal of the determination of eligibility – (b) States making an error and issuing an eligibility notice in error is not contemplated in the model language. As such, the automatic cancellation may be contrary to individual state and property right laws. BOLIM recommends that the PA be given notice and the ability to appeal (pursuant to that state’s laws and rules) and that final determination be made upon the failure of the PA to appeal or upon completion of the appeal process.”
 - L. Monick explains that this is where the SQL issues an approval for eligibility to participate in the compact, privileges are issued, and then the SQL realizes certain eligibility requirements were not met and withdraw their eligibility determination. The appeal right is through the SQL that has made the determination. The privileges cannot be good anymore because the practitioner no longer has an SQL.
 - S. Gile asks if the privileges would still be good pending the appeal from the practitioner playing out, or would they be revoked immediately following the inactivation of the SQL? It may depend on the state and their process.
 - N. Kalfas notes that once the SQL makes the ineligibility determination, the remote states do not have a say in the privileges continuing because the compact participation requirement of an active, unencumbered qualifying license is not met.
 - J. Alley notes that this is different in the IMLCC because in that compact there are individual licenses. Other participating states have different ways of managing the expedited licenses issued after the LOC letter has been revoked.
 - E. Huntley asks what S. Gile meant by it being different between states.
 - S. Gile – If an SQL realizes an eligibility determination was made in error, depending on the state, it may not result in an automatic revocation of the qualifying license as there may be more of a process to go through.
 - N. Kalfas notes the requirement for states to check the box saying there is current significant investigative information ensures public protection during those differing processes between states.

- 168 ▪ K. Scarbalis clarifies that when a qualifying license is revoked and
169 privileges are terminated as a result, a PA could still apply for a single
170 state license in those states where they held privileges.
171 ▪ Chair Loucka confirms.
172 ▪ Committee elects to maintain the language as drafted.
173 ○ Chair Loucka asks for a motion to accept the non-substantive changes to the rule
174 as discussed during this meeting.

175 **Motion:**

- 176 • Jamie Alley motions to delegate to chair and staff to make non-substantive changes as
177 discussed during the meeting.
178 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds.
179 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

180
181 **Public Comments on Draft Rule 4 – Data System**

- 182 • Chair Loucka opens the discussion on Draft Rule 4. The committee received one
183 comment from the Maine medical board.
184 • Comment 1: “Section 4.5 Confidentiality (b) –The commission may want to include
185 language that, as an instrumentality of multiple states, the PA Compact Commission
186 will not respond to FOAA requests. Those requests need to go directly to the states.”
187 ○ Chair Loucka notes this may not be something the commission wants to put in
188 a rule.
189 ○ L. Monick notes that back in December there was discussion on creating a
190 rule related to records requests and specific items that may be exempt from
191 disclosure.
192 ○ Chair Loucka confirms that the committee had decided to treat this as a
193 separate rule.
194 ○ J. Alley notes it may have been discussed as a policy rather than a rule.
195 ○ Chair Louck asks if T. Terranova agrees with the committee tabling this
196 suggestion and addressing the topic in a separate rule.
197 ○ T. Terranova confirms.
198 ○ Committee elects to maintain language as drafted.

199
200 **Draft Rule 5 – Joint Investigations**

- 201 • Chair Loucka opens the discussion on draft rule 5.
202 • N. Kalfas addresses T. Terranova’s question from last meeting on whether the rule should
203 address what happens if a state refuses to serve a lawful subpoena. The committee may
204 not want to get into what happens in those instances since it is for a court of competent
205 jurisdiction to make lawful subpoena determinations.
206 • Chair Loucka notes that states must follow their laws and procedures when it comes to
207 service of subpoenas.
208 • J. Alley notes concerns with new language under H.2 in that it might create an obligation
209 on the issuing state not only to issue the subpoena but potentially to be involved in circuit
210 court proceedings related to the lawfulness of the subpoena.
211 • T. Terranova shares concerns that states may say a subpoena is unlawful but not be
212 required to explain why it is unlawful, which could burden the investigation of the
213 requesting state.

- 214
- N. Kalfas suggests maintaining H.1 to address T. Terranova’s concern and removing H.2
- 215 for J. Alley’s concerns and potentially supplement on this topic with a policy rather than
- 216 fleshing out this process through rulemaking.
- Chair Loucka determines the committee will revisit this rule in the next meeting when the
- 217 committee has N. Kalfas’s memo on subpoenas and joint investigations. The committee
- 218 can then decide whether to remove suggested language and if additional policy is
- 219 necessary.
- 220

221

222 **Delegate Comments**

223 None.

224

225 **Public Comments**

226 None.

227

228 **Adjourn**

229 Chair Loucka adjourns the meeting at 12:08 p.m. ET.