

**House Agriculture, Water & Natural Resources**

**03/09/2026 01:30 PM**

**HB26-1183 Sunset Pet Animal Care & Facilities Act**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
<p>Julia Hastings Against themselves</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I would like to address House Bill 26-1183.</p> <p>The pet grooming industry has experienced longstanding concerns regarding the Colorado Pet Animal Care Facilities Act (PACFA) and what many in our industry believe to be repeated instances of regulatory overreach. Grooming businesses that question or push back against these practices often feel targeted through increased inspections or enforcement actions until they comply. As a result, many groomers feel intimidated and pressured to pay fees and comply with requirements that they believe exceed PACFA’s statutory authority.</p> <p>PACFA licensing is written as a facility license, yet individual groomers are frequently pressured under threat of enforcement to obtain individual licenses themselves—even when they are not the facilitator. This includes mobile or in-home groomers who simply travel to clients’ homes and do not have or operate a grooming facility of their own.</p> <p>Equally concerning is the lack of meaningful engagement with industry professionals during rulemaking. Groomers regularly attend rulemaking hearings to provide input, yet many feel their voices are not heard. At the most recent hearing regarding new vaccination requirements and comingling of pets, groomers were initially not allowed to speak. After significant pushback, a third meeting was scheduled where groomers were finally permitted to testify and explain why the proposed rules could harm the industry rather than protect it. However, representatives from the Department of Agriculture only remained on the call briefly before leaving, while groomers continued providing testimony for hours into a recorder. Ultimately, the rules were passed despite repeated requests from the industry for supporting data or documented cases that would justify such regulations. Those requests went unanswered.</p> <p>House Bill 26-1183 raises several additional concerns.</p> <p>The bill proposes removing the statutory cap on PACFA fees, leaving fee levels entirely at the agency’s discretion. Current fees are already burdensome for many groomers at approximately \$400 annually along with multiple licenses per facility. This has caused many groomers to quit being self employed and have to go back under a leadership they find lacking in all areas. Not only does PACFA not hold ROVER to the same standards of groomers and small business owners they also continually increase the cost by \$50 every year. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>JChristiana Kline</p>	<p>I respectfully oppose Colorado House Bill 26-1183.</p>

<p>Against themselves</p>	<p>This bill removes what little oversight currently exists on the Pet Animal Care Facilities Act (PACFA) program. In particular, it eliminates the existing cap on fees, despite the fact that PACFA fees have already increased steadily over the years with little transparency about why those increases occur or where the money is going.</p> <p>PACFA also frequently oversteps its intended authority. The program was designed to regulate facilities, yet in practice it often forces individual licensing requirements that go beyond what the law intended. Small businesses already face significant regulatory pressure, and expanding PACFA’s authority further will only worsen that burden.</p> <p>HB 26-1183 also reduces industry input at a time when many of us already feel unheard. Those of us working directly in pet care – groomers, boarding facilities, breeders, and other professionals – have valuable insight into how regulations actually affect animal welfare and business operations.</p> <p>Additionally, the bill increases fines on small businesses that are already strained by PACFA’s high fees and inconsistent enforcement. Inspectors often interpret standards differently; what one inspector approves, another may reject. This inconsistency creates uncertainty and unnecessary financial risk for responsible businesses that are trying to comply.</p> <p>Small pet care businesses are an important part of Colorado’s economy. We provide jobs, serve pet owners across the state, and care for the animals that Coloradans consider members of their families. Removing oversight and expanding PACFA’s unchecked authority will only make it harder for these small businesses to survive.</p> <p>Colorado needs its pet care professionals, and we need the legislature’s help to ensure regulations remain fair, transparent, and accountable.</p> <p>For these reasons, I urge you to vote NO on House Bill 26-1183.</p>
<p>Timothy Singer Against Spawlash Pet Grooming and Selfwash</p>	<p>I strongly oppose Colorado House Bill 26-1183.</p> <p>This bill removes critical oversight of the PACFA (Pet Animal Care Facilities Act) program and gives the agency even more unchecked power over Colorado’s small pet care businesses. First, the bill removes the existing cap on PACFA fees. These fees have already increased repeatedly over the years with little to no transparency about why the increases occur or where the money is being spent. Eliminating the cap gives the program unlimited authority to raise fees on small businesses that are already struggling with rising costs. Even more concerning, this bill changes program review from once a year to once every 15 years. That means PACFA could operate for a decade and a half without meaningful review or accountability. For a regulatory program that controls licensing, fees, and enforcement over an entire industry, allowing it to go unchecked for 15 years at a time is completely unreasonable. PACFA also repeatedly goes beyond its intended authority. The law was designed to license facilities, yet the program imposes those licensing requirements on individuals. This kind of regulatory overreach is already happening under the current system, and HB 26-1183 would only embolden it. The bill also reduces input from the very industries PACFA regulates, even though we are already ignored when we raise legitimate concerns. The people who work directly with animals every day: groomers, boarding</p>

	<p>facilities, breeders, and trainers, should have a voice in regulations that affect our work and the animals in our care.</p> <p>On top of this, the bill increases fines on small businesses. Many of these businesses are already under significant strain due to PACFA’s high fees and inconsistent enforcement. Inspectors frequently contradict one another, what one inspector says is acceptable, another may claim is a violation. Businesses are left trying to comply with standards that seem to change depending on who walks through the door.</p> <p>Colorado’s small pet care businesses are not the problem. We are employers, taxpayers, and professionals who care deeply about the animals entrusted to us. We provide essential services to the pet owners of this state.HB 26-1183 removes oversight, removes safeguards, raises financial burdens, and weakens industry input, all while allowing the program to go 15 years without meaningful review.That is not accountability. It is unchecked bureaucracy.If this bill passes small businesses will be forced to close</p>
<p>Natalie Gonzales Against themselves</p>	<p>I recently closed my brick and mortar. I was forced out of my business after 15 years due to a significant rent increase. The new requirements of this bill are going to add to the increasing costs of being in business. In order to comply with the requirements to isolate animals we are increasing appointment times dedicated to each client. I am currently a contract worker at a small shop. In order to comply we will have to redesign the entire space to accommodate more kennels as well as approach booking differently to ensure minimal contact between clients. These changes will limit the amount of clients ultimately passing the financial strain on the customer. In addition to financial strain this is creating unnecessary stress for animals that are not accustomed to spending time in a kennel. Many business models, mine included, are one on one appointments. Following the proper sanitation requirements as well as adhering to a one-on-one appointment model inherently limits exposure to infectious diseases. Ultimately keeping these over reaching policies will ensure small businesses and an already financially strained customer base will pay the ultimate price. I question if the potential risks of spreading infectious diseases is comparable to the strain this will put on the animal wellness industry. Shops that are complying with current safety and sanitation regulations are already protecting the community from harmful spread of diseases. I question the validity of the actual risks and the number of real world cases on which there was imminent danger to the public. I will concede that there have been outbreaks but I don’t believe these new regulations will prevent fluke outbreaks from occurring. Our industry is proud to take safety and sanitation seriously but this is government overreach at its finest.</p>
<p>Courtney Edmondson Against themselves</p>	<p>Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I would like to address House Bill 26-1183.</p> <p>The pet grooming industry has experienced longstanding concerns regarding the Colorado Pet Animal Care Facilities Act (PACFA) and what many in our industry believe to be repeated instances of regulatory overreach. Grooming businesses that question or push back against these practices often feel targeted through increased inspections or enforcement actions until they comply. As a result, many groomers</p>

	<p>feel intimidated and pressured to pay fees and comply with requirements that they believe exceed PACFA’s statutory authority.</p> <p>PACFA licensing is written as a facility license, yet individual groomers are frequently pressured under threat of enforcement to obtain individual licenses themselves—even when they are not the facilitator. This includes mobile or in-home groomers who simply travel to clients’ homes and do not have or operate a grooming facility of their own.</p> <p>Equally concerning is the lack of meaningful engagement with industry professionals during rulemaking. Groomers regularly attend rulemaking hearings to provide input, yet many feel their voices are not heard. At the most recent hearing regarding new vaccination requirements and comingling of pets, groomers were initially not allowed to speak. After significant pushback, a third meeting was scheduled where groomers were finally permitted to testify and explain why the proposed rules could harm the industry rather than protect it. However, representatives from the Department of Agriculture only remained on the call briefly before leaving, while groomers continued providing testimony for hours into a recorder. Ultimately, the rules were passed despite repeated requests from the industry for supporting data or documented cases that would justify such regulations. Those requests went unanswered.</p> <p>House Bill 26-1183 raises several additional concerns.</p> <p>First, the bill proposes removing the statutory cap on PACFA fees, leaving fee levels entirely at the agency’s discretion. Current fees are already burdensome for many groomers at approximately \$400 annually. The existing statutory cap of \$700 was intended to provide an important safeguard. Rather than removing that cap, many in the industry believe it should re</p>
<p>Calida Troxell Against themselves</p>	<p>I have been in the industry overseen by pacfa since the late 1990’s. Although I have always agreed with their vision I have found that each year that PACFA assumes a greater umbrella of authority and demands a larger portion of our income. Increasing the duplication of legislation and overstepping the original intent seems</p>

	<p>to be a theme. Pacfa needs oversight and those of us in the industry that voluntarily participate in this revenue stream for the state ask that the whole idea of pacfa be revisited for necessity. Free markets in today's age demand that our businesses operate with quality and compassion, giving the government millions in fees doesn't make that happen. Pacfa has no reach in oversight over the growing number of online care providers and there is already incentive to operate outside the purview of pacfa. The more pacfa demands higher fees the more people will operate outside the system. Making more rules and raising fines won't deter bad businesses, consumers do that.</p>
--	---