

**2026 Legislative Priority Proposal**  
**Updated: 7/17/25**

<b>Massage Facility Background Check Clean-Up</b>	
<b>Larimer County (Commissioner Jody Shaddock-McNally)</b>	
Preferred Contact:	shaddujl@co.larimer.co.us
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	N/A
Who is your subject matter expert?	Shane Atkinson, Legislative Coordinator; atkinsrs@larimer.org; 970-481-6741
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes.
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes.
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Current law requires certain people associated with massage facilities to get a background check and further requires cities and counties to adopt a "process" to ensure the required background checks are completed. Cities and counties can but are not required to adopt licensing regulations for massage facilities, but regardless of if you have a licensing scheme in place, you are required to have a "process" to ensure the background checks are done. Most counties don't license businesses, including massage facilities. Some counties have decided that they want to regulate these businesses, but for most counties this creates a significant unfunded mandate.
Areas of Impact:	Day-to-day operations of the county; Functionality of county programs or services; Unfunded Mandate on Counties.
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	<a href="#">HB24-1371</a> .
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	(1) Make this required "process" optional for counties to do.

	(2) Another potential approach is to have the state take this on since they already have a licensing scheme in place for massage therapists and other professions. They have the mechanisms in place to do this without putting the burden on counties, who will largely have to build the mechanism.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	Amend 30-15-401.4(1)(a)(IV)(B) by replacing the first word "Require" with "Authorize."  Amend 30-15-401.4(3.5) by replacing "shall establish a process" in the first line with "may establish a process, in which case the process must be..."
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	The passage of HB24-1371 created this requirement, state law would have to change in order to ease the burden.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a solution to this problem before?	Unsure, but there was discussion about this at the CCI Summer Conference.
What possible organization(s) would <b>support</b> your proposed solution?	CML- Multiple municipalities have begun raising concerns about implementation. It sounds like CML may be seeking legislation that carves municipalities out, and fully places this burden on counties.
What possible organization(s) would <b>oppose</b> your proposed solution?	Unsure.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	No.
What are the financial implications of this <b>problem</b> to your county?	We have determined creating a licensing structure or alternative solution ensuring the background checks are completed will cost counties significant resources and staff time. There are no financial implications to the solution.

Are there any financial implications to this <b>solution</b> either?	
<p>What are the financial implications of this <b>problem</b> to any other impacted parties?</p> <p>What are the financial implications of this <b>solution</b> to any other impacted parties?  <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i></p>	<p>If solution one is adopted, it will not have a cost to the state. If solution two is adopted, it might carry a minor fiscal note for the state, but at least they already have a mechanism in place.</p>