



PA Compact Rules Committee Meeting Minutes **July 20, 2026**

Name	Member Role	Voting Member	Attendance
Jamie Alley	WV Delegate	x	x
Susan Gile	KS Delegate	x	Joined during roll call
Valeska Barr	OK Delegate	x	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
Robert Sanders	WI Delegate	x	
Amber Houge	IA Delegate	x	x
Total voting members present		Quorum – 5/9	8/9
Marisa Courtney	Vice Chair PA Commission		x
Jennifer Kolb	Interim 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		
Laura Monick	OH Alternate		

VOTES					
Name	Agenda	Adopt Minutes from June 8, 2026	Adopt & Transmit Draft Rule 5 – Joint Investigations to Full Commission	Adopt & Transmit Draft Rule 7 – State Compliance to Full Commission	Adopt & Transmit Draft Bylaw Amendments to Full Commission
Jamie Alley		2		1	
Valeska Barr					1
Elizabeth Huntley	2		1	2	

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

4 **Welcome**

5 **Call to order/Roll Call**

6
7 Chair Loucka calls meeting to order at 11:02 a.m. ET.

8 A. Mortell takes roll. 8/9 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 • Larry Marx motions to adopt the agenda.
- 14 • Elizabeth Huntley seconds.
- 15 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

16 17 **Minutes from June 8, 2026**

18 Committee reviews the draft minutes. Chair Loucka asks for a motion to adopt minutes from
19 June 8, 2026.

20 **Motion:**

- 21 • Larry Marx motions to adopt June 8, 2026, minutes.
- 22 • Jamie Alley seconds.
- 23 • All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

24 25 **Public Comments on Draft Rule 5 – Joint Investigations and Draft Rule 7 – State** 26 **Compliance**

- 27 • Chair Loucka opens discussion on public comments.
- 28 • North Dakota board comment:
 - 29 ○ **“Rule 5.2(h)** – stating that participant states in a joint investigation ‘shall’
 - 30 cooperate with lawful requests from another state on issuing joint
 - 31 subpoenas. However, under PA Compact Law, Section 6: Adverse Action – uses
 - 32 ‘may’ in reference to issuance of subpoenas with exceptions noted in subsection 3
 - 33 in which subpoenas cannot be issued to gather evidence of conduct in another
 - 34 state that is lawful in that other state. We would therefore respectfully request the

- rule be changed from ‘shall’ to ‘may’ and take into account exceptions outlined by Compact Law.”
- Chair Loucka recommends maintaining the language as drafted since the rule stipulates that the subpoenas states must enforce must be “lawful.”
 - N. Kalfas notes a court of competent jurisdiction in the state receiving the subpoena may inquire as to whether the information being requested is lawful.
 - No objections, rule is maintained as drafted in this regard.
 - North Dakota board comment:
 - “**Rule 7** – specifically how 7.3 binds states to mediation. Mediation is generally not allowed under our state law. Although we could argue that the Compact law trumps other state law and that section 10 of the compact allows the commission to promulgate a rule providing for mediation – the rules would not trump our state law and therefore cannot mandate the mediation into rule – especially when the law does not specifically make the mediation binding. We would therefore respectfully request the rule again be changed to a ‘may’ provision.”
 - Chair Loucka recommends maintaining the rule as drafted after consulting with Commission interim legal counsel because the rule does not prevent a state from going forward with arbitration instead of mediation.
 - N. Kalfas notes the rule contemplates discretion for the Commission’s Executive Committee to determine a path forward in the event a state is not comfortable with binding mediation and going forward with arbitration is their preference.
 - No objections, rule is maintained as drafted in this regard.
 - Maine board comment:
 - “**Chapter 5 section 5.1 (d)** – the term ‘Confidential and filed under seal’ does not appear to be used in the rule and best practice is to only define terms used in the rule. In addition, there is a concern that only state legislatures can determine what information is confidential and that ability cannot be delegated to agencies or other entities. Part of the information transmitted by the state as part of this chapter could be considered public in that state, but this definition would make it confidential.”
 - Chair Loucka recommends accepting this comment and removing the definition.
 - No objections, definition removed from draft rule 5.
 - Alabama board comment:
 - “The Board would like to draw the Commission’s attention to the fact that the term ‘[c]onfidential and filed under seal’ is defined in the definitions section of Rule 5, however, this term is not utilized anywhere in the substantive content of Rule 5. The Board questions the effect and implementation of the provisions contained in this definition if the term is not utilized anywhere in the operative portion of the rule.”
 - Subject of this comment was addressed during discussion of Maine board’s comment above.
 - Maine board comment:
 - “**Chapter 5 section 5.1 (i)** – the definition for minor infraction is vague and subjective and is only used in another definition. It may be better to remove the definition and add clarifying language to (p) in place of minor infraction such as

81 ‘would demonstrate an issue of competence, incompetence, unethical or
82 unprofessional conduct.’”

- 83 ■ Chair Loucka recommends adding reference to or incorporating language
84 from Rule 4.6 regarding the Commission and information sharing.
- 85 ■ J. Alley suggests moving definition for minor infraction to (p), definition
86 for Significant Investigation Information, as that is the only place the term
87 appears.

- 88 • No objections, change is incorporated.

- 89 ■ T. Terranova requests reference to Rule 4 also be added to Rule 5.2 (k).
- 90 ■ N. Kalfas suggests (k) be amended to read “pursuant to Section 4.B. *and*
91 *in accordance with Rule 4.*”

- 92 • No objections, change is incorporated.

- 93 ■ N. Kalfas notes changes to draft Rule 5 would not constitute substantive
94 changes as they are intended to amplify the existing language in the draft
95 rule.

- 96 • Maine board comment:

- 97 ○ “**Chapter 5 section 5.2 (k)** – this section does not indicate if or how the Compact
98 Commission will report the information to participating states. Should it?”

- 99 ■ Chair Loucka suggests that the committee may not want to be this specific
100 in rule as this is an operational matter.
- 101 ■ N. Kalfas notes the current draft of the Commission’s data system contract
102 contemplates a push notification system for adverse action reporting, but it
103 is slightly premature to answer this question at this juncture before the
104 data system development is underway.
- 105 ■ V. Barr asks if it can be stated generically in rule that states will be
106 notified?
- 107 ■ Chair Loucka suggests adding language “by the participating state that
108 took the adverse action, *and all impacted states shall be notified.*”
- 109 ■ J. Kolb notes there should be a process for closing the loop once an
110 investigation is complete to notify states whether there were no findings or
111 an adverse action taken.
- 112 ■ N. Kalfas notes there is a distinction between states checking a box within
113 the data system certifying the existence of significant investigatory
114 information versus taking adverse action against a practitioner. It is
115 common for commissions to establish a time certain where states must
116 audit the information put into the data system and update it as needed, and
117 this Commission may have established a time certain within Rule 4.
 - 118 • Interim legal counsel will review Commission’s rules for timeline
119 for reporting after final resolution.
- 120 ■ J. Kolb asks if the PA Compact or other compacts have a rule about
121 notification, as it may cause unfair bias against a practitioner applying for
122 a compact privilege or license in another state.
- 123 ■ N. Kalfas confirms notification of the existence of current significant
124 investigatory information is common, specifically among the counseling,
125 ASLP, PT, and OT compacts.

- A. Houge asks if there are guidelines for what is considered significant investigative information.
- N. Kalfas confirms it is a term defined by the Commission in rule.
 - J. Alley provides SII definition in meeting chat.
- N. Kalfas notes draft Rule 5 would benefit from an infographic that clarifies when information is released publicly.
 - No objections to Chair Loucka's language addition, change incorporated in draft rule.
 - N. Kalfas notes this is not a substantive change as the authority for reporting to states exists within the compact model language.
- S. Gile leaves the meeting 11:31 a.m. ET.
- Chair Loucka calls for motion to approve draft rule 5 as amended during today's meeting for transmission to Full Commission.

Motion:

- Elizabeth Huntley motions to adopt draft Rule 5 – Joint Investigations with non-substantive changes and transmit to the Full Commission.
- Larry Marx seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.
- Chair Loucka calls for a motion to approve draft Rule 7 as drafted for transmission to the Full Commission.

Motion:

- Jamie Alley motions to adopt draft Rule 7 – State Compliance as drafted and transmit to the Full Commission.
- Elizabeth Huntley seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Draft Bylaw Amendments

- Chair Loucka opens discussion on draft bylaw amendments.
- A. Mortell notes the committee did not receive public comments on the draft bylaw amendments, so the committee may vote to move them to the Full Commission for consideration.
- Chair Loucka requests motion to approve draft bylaw amendments for transmission to Full Commission.

Motion:

- Valeska Barr motions to move draft bylaw amendments to the Full Commission.
- Amber Houge seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Draft Rule 8 – Records Exempt from Disclosure

- Chair Loucka opens discussion on draft Rule 8 – Records Exempt from Disclosure.
- A. Mortell notes this is the second draft of the rule, which includes the addition of Section 8.3 – Publicly available records and an addition to 8.4 – Other Records that were added in response to committee's discussion last month.

- J. Kolb notes the addition of “When the Executive Committee designates records as confidential, a report out to the full Commission will be made at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting” is process oriented, so it could be addressed in policy rather than rule.
- J. Alley favors leaving the section as is, so there is an established requirement to notify the full Commission if the Executive Committee acts in this capacity.
- T. Terranova and Chair Loucka concur with J. Alley’s comment.

Motion:

- Larry Marx motions to adopt draft Rule 8 – Records Exempt from Disclosure as reviewed during today’s meeting and transmit to the Executive Committee.
- Valeska Barr seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Draft Rule 2 – Definitions

- Chair Loucka opens discussion on draft Rule 2 – Definitions, noting the rule will be updated as new rules are promulgated, and additional defined terms need to be added.
- N. Kalfas notes the committee has seen the definitions in this rule as they come from the rules drafted by the committee, and each individual rule contains a preamble with any defined terms contained therein.
- J. Alley asks if definitions from the model compact will be incorporated into this rule.
 - Chair Loucka and N. Kalfas note this committee previously determined compact definitions did not need to be incorporated as the purpose section of this rule states “Terms not specifically defined in these Rules shall have the definition as set forth in the Compact.”
- J. Alley asks whether there are any definitions in this draft rule not already in the preamble of one or more rules drafted by this committee.
 - Chair Loucka confirms all definitions in the draft rule appear in the preamble of the rules in which they are used.

Motion:

- Jamie Alley motions to adopt draft Rule 2 – Definitions and transmit to the Executive Committee.
- Larry Marx seconds.
- All members present voted in favor; none abstained; motion passed.

Delegate & Public Comments

- None.

Adjourn

Chair Loucka adjourns the meeting at 11:57 a.m. ET.