

## 2026 Legislative Priority Proposal Updated: 9/15/25

Massage Facility Background Check Clean-Up		
Larimer County (Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally)		
Preferred Contact:	shaddujl@co.larimer.co.us	
Co-Sponsoring	N/A	
Counties/Commissioners:		
Who is your subject	Shane Atkinson, Legislative Coordinator; atkinsrs@larimer.org; 970-481-	
matter expert?	6741	
Has this proposal been	Yes.	
approved by your BoCC?		
Have you reviewed the	Yes.	
CCI Instructional Memo?		
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?	HB24-1371.	
What is your initial proposal to solve this	(1) Make this required "process" optional for counties to do.	
problem?	(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 <i>problem</i> 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?	
What are the financial implications of this <i>problem</i> to any other impacted parties?	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.
What are the financial implications of this <b>solution</b> to any	

other impacted parties?	
Please consider any	
relevant Colorado State	
Departments.	
Staff Feedback	Risk / Difficulty: High - This bill is challenging for three reasons. First, CCI championed the original law change in 2024 and there are counties that continue to support it today. Second, there is legislative fatigue about this issue since there was a clean-up bill run in the 2025 legislative session. Third, there are multiple levels of government (local, state, and federal) that must be on the same page on this issue. Additionally, the Colorado Municipal League is contemplating legislation to make portions of the existing law optional for home rule municipalities.
	Time Commitment: High - This bill requires a high level of engagement with legislators who will likely be skeptical of another clean-up bill, with municipalities to align priorities, and with the state Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure the approach sought by this bill does not negatively impact counties that seek to implement the current law.