

Ollie's Law Advisory Committee Meeting
Minutes April 30, 2025 | 9 AM – 10:30 AM
APPROVED 5/13/2025

Advisory Committee Attendance

Mike Cahill
Louis Pacheco
Jeni Mather
Kathy MacKenzie
Mark Hogan
Carmen Rustenbeck
Dr. Erin Doyle
Noelle Wilson
Francine Coughlin
Debra Cameron
Kara Holmquist
Kevin Sullivan

Advisory Committee Absence

Amy Baxter -absent for meeting

MDAR Attendees

Jessica Burgess
Katherine Foote
Sheri Gustafson

Public Attendees

35 additional ZOOM attendees

This open meeting was held virtually over the ZOOM webinar platform. 882 4929 0760
Meeting ID: Passcode: animal

I. AC Attendance Roll Call

Mathers started meeting at 9:01 AM by roll call.
Cahill-present, Pacheco-present, Hogan-present, Doyle-present, Coughlin-present,
Rustenbeck-present, Holmquist- present. MacKenzie-present, Sullivan-present

Wilson- missing at roll call joined 9:33 AM, Cameron-missing at roll call joined 9:29 AM

II. Minutes Review for April 8, 2025

Mather asked Gustafson to correct the spelling of her name in the minutes.

Pacheco motioned to accept the minutes from the AC meeting on 4/8/25. Mather-second. Roll call: Doyle-yes, Cahill-yes, Pacheco-yes, MacKenzie-yes, Hogan-yes, Rustenbeck-yes, Coughlin-yes, Holmquist-yes, Sullivan-yes, Minutes for April 8th, 2025 Ollie's Law AC Meeting accepted.

III, Framework Setting and Panning Discussion

Mather stated that adjustments had been made to the meeting agenda this time to make sure the group will have a good understanding of facilities and to try to ensure that they are not creating a one size fits all approach. She asks the group to consider joining the facebook page "MA Dog Daycare Owners United" to get education on facilities.

A. Facility Category Framework to guide regulation development

1. Discuss and define facility categories
2. **Approve use of facility categories as framework- vote required**

Mather shared a document named "Facility Models for Commercial Daycare and Boarding in Massachusetts" with the group. She asked Mike if the information displayed was correct. Cahill responded that the statutes were correct. Mather quickly scanned through the definitions in the document and said she would share them with the group.

Pacheco stated that he had also created a matrix to help illustrate the groups and categories and then listed their importance. This document will be shared a little later in the meeting.

Cameron asked about dog sitters with organizations like Rover and their classification. Cahill responded that he would give his opinion but to remember that this is his interpretation of a statute that he didn't write. He stated that in the definitions and statutes, the word establishment isn't defined. ACOs are the enforcement authority of the statutes, and they will also have their interpretation. Cahill stressed that it is important to look at the activity that is happening to determine what applies. For example, if a person is hired to watch a dog in the owner's home or to walk the dog on public land, those activities aren't addressed. If the person is hired to bring the dog to their home, then they could fall under the kennel definition, and the kennel would need to be licensed.

Cahill stated that there is an issue with online establishments not checking licensing status and with municipalities not being able to obtain contact information for the people listed as providing services.

Mather stated that if her employees want to walk dogs barding with them on state-owned land, they do need to get permission.

Mather moved the conversation to discuss the timeline and stated it is important for the group to establish some clear wins.

B. Timeline and Topic Grouping Overview

1. Present proposed topic timeline and calendar

2. Discuss rationale for phased approach
3. Review quick-win opportunities

Mather shared documents for proposed meeting schedule and timeline and asked AC for feedback. Documents shared were “Proposed AC Meeting Dates”, “Ollie’s Law Meeting Spacing Heatmap”.

Pacheco asked about document sharing. Burgess responded that all documents should be sent to Gustafson after the meeting. Documents created should be initially shared during the open meeting, after the meeting it will then be shared with the group.

Coughlin asked about edits in documents that have been shared in the open meeting and if they needed to be done in real time.

Burgess stated that documents can be modified as discussed in the open meeting.

Coughlin asked if they needed to make a motion to accept the proposed meeting dates. Burgess said that is not necessary.

Cahill stated that the department has a deadline for filing regulations and will need to have things drafted, edited, and voted upon by January. Cahill asked Burgess for clarification about what part of the process they would need to be in.

Burgess stated that the department will need ample time to review before the deadlines, but that drafts of the regulations will not be shared prior.

Cahill said that the department will try to mirror what is discussed in the AC meeting and that the AC needs to have discussions on categories, but they should not be focused on trying to create specific wording.

Mather stated that she would adjust the timeline to focus on making sure all categories are discussed.

Pacheco shared document “This Document is a Working Draft Prepared for Use”. The document contained a chart rating the importance of different discussion categories and the importance of them to various stakeholders.

Cameron said that the matrix is very helpful and suggested using categories from the poll for guidance.

Doyle asked how are we using the facilities as framework, since any regs developed should be able to be applied universally.

IV. Educational Grounding Materials

A. Review and orient to foundational regulations and resources to support upcoming discussions on minimum care standards

1. Shelter/Rescue and Pet Shop Regulations
2. CA/CO/CT Commercial Kennel Regulations
3. IBPSA Facility Standards,
4. ASPCA Five Domains

Mather shared documents “Comparative Analysis Current Laws” with the group, and “Animal Welfare Summary”.

Holmquist shared document “Information Related to General Facility and Animal Facility Regulations” with the group. She gave a quick overview of how it is organized.

Doyle brought up that she would like the group to review a published document called “ASV Guidelines for Standards of Care in animal shelters”.

V. Future Meeting Schedule

- A. Present and review proposed meeting dates and cadence
- B. Discuss meeting frequency
- C. Confirm agreement to proceed or modify structure as needed

Mather discussed meeting schedule and frequency earlier in meeting under B. Timeline and Topic Grouping Overview.

The next AC meeting was set for May 13, 2025 at 9 AM.

VI. New Business

Mather again the Facebook page “MA Dog Daycare Owners United” and told the group that on that page is information about a recent filing that could potentially give kennel owners the discretion to allow for alternate ID on dogs at facilities such as microchips. Mather asked if the AC needs to respond to a letter received from Dogtopia on the matter.

Gustafson explained that she spoke with the individual who sent the letter and directed them to reach out to the MSPCA or ARL since it was a legislative matter but that she would pass on the letter to the AC as well.

Mather asked if there was any additional business to discuss or if they could motion to adjourn.

Cahill motioned to adjourn. Mckenzie gave a 2nd. Roll call to adjourn. All responses-yes

10:29 meeting adjourned.