
Subject: CONSTITUENT MENTION: Opposition to Specific Provisions of HB26-1181 (LLS No. 26-0355.01)

Dear Representative Lieder and Representative Stewart,

As a constituent and a professional in the beauty industry living in Lakewood, I am writing to express my significant concerns regarding **HB26-1181** (the continuation of the Barber and Cosmetologist Act). While I support the continuation of the Act, several proposed exemptions and changes in this bill threaten public safety and the integrity of our profession.

I respectfully ask that you consider the following amendments to the current draft (LLS No. 26-0355.01):

1. Protection of Licensed Services & Public Safety

- **Unlicensed Volunteers:** We oppose exemptions allowing unlicensed individuals to perform shampooing, hair cutting, or nail services. This undermines the value of professional licensure and risks public health.
- **Hair Styling:** All hair styling services should remain under the scope of barbering and cosmetology licensure to maintain professional standards and client safety.
- **Makeup Services:** Makeup application involves high risks of cross-contamination. Anyone charging for event-based makeup (bridal, theatrical, etc.) must be licensed. Retailers should be limited to product demonstrations only.

2. Regulatory Clarity & Oversight

- **"Home Color" Definition:** The current language is dangerously vague. We need a clear definition of "home color" to prevent the unsafe handling of professional-grade chemicals by unlicensed users.
- **Microblading:** This must remain under permanent makeup regulations (requiring 132 hours of education) rather than being shifted to tattoo oversight, which lacks the specialized training required for this service.
- **Eyelash Services:** This section must be updated to explicitly include lash tabs, bands, and extensions, and must formally include **estheticians** to reflect modern industry practice.

3. Maintaining Industry Standards

- **Retention of the Advisory Committee:** We strongly believe the advisory committee is essential for "temperature checking" the industry and ensuring regulations align with current professional standards. Its removal would leave a vacuum in expert oversight.
- **Educational Impact:** Removing core services from licensure creates a dangerous misalignment between school curriculums, state testing, and workforce expectations.

4. Economic Impact

- **Unfair Competition:** Expanding exemptions for unlicensed styling and nail services creates an uneven playing field for professionals who have invested significant time and tuition into their careers.

I urge you to advocate for these changes during the House Business Affairs & Labor Committee hearing to protect Colorado's professionals and consumers.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dudding

Cosmetology Instructor; Emily Griffith Technical College

8141 W Eastman Pl. 13-104, Lakewood, Co'

303-906-0828

March 3, 2026

Chairwoman Naquetta Ricks
Honorable Members of the House Business Affairs and Labor Committee
Colorado State Capitol
200 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203-1784

Re: HB26-1181 Sunset Barber & Cosmetologist Act

Dear Chairwoman Ricks,

The Professional Beauty Association (PBA) appreciates your hard work on [HB26-1181](#) and supports the extension of the Barber and Cosmetologist Act, as well as the modernization of statutory language reflected in the bill.

Colorado's professional beauty industry represents a \$1.6 billion sector of the state's economy, supporting nearly 13,000 jobs across more than 2,800 small business establishments. The industry continues to operate successfully under the state's existing regulatory framework, which has provided clear health, safety, and sanitation standards for both consumers and business owners.

As HB26-1181 moves forward, PBA respectfully shares our position regarding provisions that exempt certain services currently included within the scope of practice under cosmetology (Section 6). Small businesses operating in the professional beauty industry depend on regulatory clarity and uniform standards to create stable environments where they can grow and provide employment opportunities.

Exempt services may unintentionally increase risk for small business owners. Disputes that would otherwise fall within a defined regulatory framework may shift directly into civil litigation.

Current education and training requirements have a positive impact, while also providing small businesses with the regulatory certainty necessary to operate responsibly and remain insurable.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this perspective and thank you for your continued leadership and service to the State of Colorado.

Respectfully,

Leslie J. Perry

Leslie Perry, Chief Executive Officer

House Business Affairs & Labor

03/05/2026 01:30 PM

HB26-1181 Sunset Barber & Cosmetologist Act

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Chelsea Finn Against themselves	<p>My name is Chelsea Finn and I am a licensed hairdresser in Frederick, CO with 13 years of experience. I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB26-1181 in its current form.</p> <p>I spent 1200+ hours in school and passed state board exams to ensure I can handle caustic chemicals, recognize skin diseases, and prevent the spread of bloodborne pathogens. By allowing unlicensed individuals to perform "minor" services or removing the Advisory Committee, this bill treats our profession as a hobby rather than a regulated health and safety industry.</p> <p>De-regulating these services does not "lower barriers"; it lowers the safety standards for Colorado citizens. I urge you to protect the integrity of our licenses and the safety of our salons.</p> <p>Sincerely, Chelsea Finn License # COS.0700194</p>
Jesse Finn Against themselves	<p>My name is Jesse Finn and I live in Frederick. I am writing to urge you to vote NO on HB26-1181.</p> <p>As a consumer, I rely on the state of Colorado to ensure that the professionals providing personal care services—especially those involving sharp tools and hazardous chemicals—are properly trained and licensed.</p>

	<p>â€‹I find it concerning that this bill would allow unlicensed individuals to perform services like hair cutting or chemical applications. I want to know that when my family enters a salon, we are in the hands of a professional who has met state-mandated safety standards. Please do not lower the bar for public health in our state.</p> <p>â€‹Sincerely, Jesse Finn</p>
<p>Michelle Greeott Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Michelle Greeott and I am a resident of Longmont. I am writing to voice my deep concern regarding HB26-1181, the Sunset Barber & Cosmetologist Act.</p> <p>â€‹As a long-time resident of Colorado and a regular client of licensed stylists, I strongly believe that the current standards for licensing must be maintained. My daughter is a licensed professional, and I have seen firsthand the intense training she underwentâ€”not just to style hair, but to prevent the spread of disease, handle hazardous chemicals safely, and protect the public.</p> <p>â€‹The idea of allowing "unlicensed volunteers" to perform these services or removing the expert Advisory Committee is a step backward for our state. I want to know that when I or my neighbors go to a salon, we are protected by state-mandated safety standards.</p> <p>â€‹Please vote NO on this bill in its current form to keep our communities safe.</p> <p>â€‹Sincerely, Michelle Greeott</p>
<p>Hannah Landau Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose because I value professional safety standards in Colorado salons.</p>

<p>Rachel Wallace Against themselves</p>	<p>Deregulation of the Hair and Beauty industry is a TERRIBLE idea! The health and wellbeing of people depends on the ability to trust our stylists. There are dangerous chemicals that, when used incorrectly, can cause serious chemical burns! Not to mention public health concerns with the safety and health standards that are required by the current regulations! I care about the public safety and health of myself and other individuals who trust our regulated stylists to keep us all safe! DO NOT DEREGULATE!</p>
<p>Theresa Battista Against themselves</p>	<p>I am a licensed cosmetologist who had to undergo 1500 hours of training to learn the dangers of chemical mixing, blood born pathogens, skin diseases, sanitation practices, and more. Giving just anyone the ability to perform color or nails or skin services with the use of chemicals without proper knowledge on chemical reactions, processing, and treatments is not only terrifying for the well being of those future clients and their safety, but it is insulting to us professionals who did it the correct way by completing the proper course work and STATE TESTING, to have integrity to perform these services with the clients safety in our best interest. The world of beauty is often brushed off as a hobby or a fun, cute, girly career path. It's not. It requires knowledge of human anatomy, skin diseases, proper sanitation between services, mixing of ammoniated hair colors, lighteners, color theory, and MUCH MORE. PLEASE do not allow Joe from down the street to perform a hair coloring or nail service and expect it to go well.</p>
<p>Paul Battista Against themselves</p>	<p>I value professional safety standards and licensing requirements and continuing education requirements for professional in Colorado salons. Why would you want to remove these standards and endanger public health?</p>
<p>Mya Tortoriello Against themselves</p>	<p>I have been a hairstylist for 6 years I paid and did my time in school to learn what you need to know about chemicals, skin diseases, genetics that can be affecting your hair or skin. This all took time and money. I don't believe this is something you can do without the education because of safety, you run risks of chemical burns, skin diseases, lice, etc. I am concerned for the safety of others if licensing is no longer required.</p> <p>Please don't do this to us this is our livelihood and you'll be greatly disrupting hundreds of thousands people's lives</p>

<p>Mackenzey Wyckoff Against themselves</p>	<p>I value professional safety standards in Colorado salons. This bill is absolutely terrifying to allow unlicensed individuals to perform salon services. I am absolutely against this bill.</p>
<p>Breana Anderson Against themselves</p>	<p>I oppose the bill because I value Professional safety standards in Colorado Salons.</p>
<p>Denise Shine Against themselves</p>	<p>Training for infection, safety and spread of disease is necessary for health and welfare.</p>
<p>Kirsten Ziadeh Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Kirsten, and I am a licensed beauty professional in Colorado. I write in strong opposition to HB26-1181 and any interpretation that would weaken licensure standards for hair and aesthetic services.</p> <p>Hair, skin, and facial services are not hobbies. They directly affect a person's appearance, confidence, health, and safety. The scalp and skin are complex and sensitive. When handled improperly, the damage can be immediate and sometimes permanent.</p> <p>Hair color alone is chemistry. Licensed professionals are trained in hair structure, porosity, elasticity, chemical reactions, developer strengths, timing, formulation, and safe application. One incorrect mixture or improper overlap can result in severe breakage, scalp burns, or permanent hair loss. This is not guesswork – it is science that requires formal education and examination.</p> <p>The same is true for aesthetic services. Chemical peels, waxing, and extractions carry risks of scarring, infection, hyperpigmentation, and allergic reactions when performed incorrectly. The skin is the</p>

	<p>body’s largest organ, and working on the face demands knowledge of contraindications, sanitation, and infection control.</p> <p>Licensing exists to protect the public. Colorado professionals complete hundreds to thousands of hours of training, pass state board exams, and follow strict sanitation and safety standards. We are educated in bloodborne pathogens, chemical safety, and proper consultation procedures. We also invest continually in advanced education because this industry evolves rapidly. Ongoing training is essential to keeping clients safe.</p> <p>Allowing unlicensed individuals to perform regulated services removes accountability, standardized education, and consumer protection. Clients may not know whether the person providing services has proper training. That uncertainty creates unnecessary risk.</p> <p>This bill also proposes removing the advisory committee within the Barber and Cosmetologist Act. Maintaining that committee is critical. It ensures that experienced industry professionals have a voice in regulatory decisions. Without it, there is a risk that changes to licensing standards could be made without sufficient professional expertise or public safety focus.</p> <p>An advisory committee promotes transparency, accountability, and thoughtful evaluation of licensure requirements. Licensing standards should never be weakened without careful review by qualified professionals who understand the real-world consequences.</p>
<p>Allison Eichner Against themselves</p>	<p>As a consumer of beauty treatments I am horrified by the possibility of beauty technicians operating in our state without a license. Abandoning beauty and barber licenses puts all Coloradans at risk and undermines the cosmetologist profession as a whole.</p>
<p>Bob Dicino Against</p>	<p>No change to the existing law. Safety First!!!</p>

<p>themselves</p>	
<p>Anastasia Stockho Against themselves</p>	<p>Bill HB26-1181 has good parts, specifically those designed to clarify certain procedures in cosmetology. The main problem with this bill is Section 6, Article 3e, which reads, "[Section 6 Article 3] THIS ARTICLE 105 DOES NOT APPLY TO THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS OR SERVICES... [E.] ...AN INDIVIDUAL WHO PREPARES HAIR COLOR FOR A CLIENT TO USE AT HOME..." It is my understanding that hair color, when mixed by a non-professional, can pose health risks as listed in section 3 of this article: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov. It lists allergic reactions, and even more serious concerns such as DLE [Section 3.1] and AKI [Section 3.3]. For these reasons, section 6, article 3e of Bill HB26-1181 must be reevaluated to ensure clients' safety.</p> <p>Section 6, Article 3d, also poses issues. It states, "[Section 6 Article 3] THIS ARTICLE 105 DOES NOT APPLY TO THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS OR SERVICES... [D.] A N INDIVIDUAL WHO IS EMPLOYED TO PROVIDE HAIR AND MAKEUP SERVICES FOR THEATRICAL, TELEVISION, OR MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTIONS..." Safety is again at risk while these hair and makeup artists perform many or all of the procedures that a standard cosmetologist performs. Section 6, Article 3d of Bill HB26-1181 should also be reevaluated, and professional theater, television, and film makeup and hair artists should be held to the same safety standards as other cosmetologists.</p> <p>For these reasons, I ask for a reevaluation of Bill HB26-1181 to remove the risk of compromising Americans' safety. Thank you.</p>
<p>Jennifer York Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposed to deregulation of the cosmetology and barber industry. I depend on my licensed stylist to keep me safe and to stay current on best practices. This is a matter of public health and safety. Please do not eliminate the licensing requirement.</p>
<p>Lauren Opperman Against</p>	<p>I oppose the bill because I value professional safety standards in Colorado salons.</p>

<p>themselves</p>	
<p>Leslie Edwards Amend themselves</p>	<p>My biggest concern with seeing what an Esthetician can do is skincare has been removed along with any beautifying the face, such as makeup, lashes, brow services.</p>
<p>Lexus Mabry Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Lexus Mabry, and I am a licensed esthetician and an esthetics instructor in Aurora, Colorado. I respectfully submit this written testimony in opposition to HB26-1181.</p> <p>As someone who works directly in this industry—“not only as a practitioner but also as an educator”—I see firsthand how essential proper licensing, regulation, and oversight are to public health, safety, and professional standards. The Barber and Cosmetology Act exists to protect consumers, ensure sanitation protocols are upheld, and maintain educational standards that prepare students to safely serve the public.</p> <p>Weakening or sunseting these regulatory structures could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce accountability within the industry • Lower education and sanitation standards • Put clients at risk of injury, infection, or improper chemical exposure • Undermine the professional credibility that licensed professionals have worked hard to build <p>Our industry involves close physical contact, sharp tools, and chemical products that require proper training and regulation. Without clear and enforceable standards, consumer safety is compromised.</p> <p>Students invest significant time and financial resources into meeting Colorado’s licensing requirements. Licensed professionals build</p>

	<p>businesses in compliance with these laws. Any action that destabilizes this regulatory structure negatively impacts small business owners, educators, students, and—most importantly—the public we serve.</p> <p>For these reasons, I urge you to vote NO on HB26-1181 and preserve the standards that protect both consumers and licensed professionals.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Respectfully, Lexus Mabry Esthetician, License # COZ.0707766 Aurora, Colorado</p>
<p>Marisol Espinoza None herself</p>	<p>Chair and Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Marisol Espinoza, and I am a licensed barber and barber instructor in Colorado with over 25 years of experience in the barbering and cosmetology industry. I currently teach and mentor future barbers, preparing them to enter a licensed profession that prioritizes sanitation, safety, and professional standards.</p> <p>I am here today regarding HB26-1181, the Sunset Barber and Cosmetology Act.</p> <p>Barbering and cosmetology are professions that require hands-on skills, sanitation knowledge, and an understanding of public health. In our classrooms and training clinics, we teach students not only how to cut hair, but also how to properly disinfect tools, prevent the spread of infections, and safely serve the public. Licensing and regulatory oversight help ensure that professionals entering this industry are properly trained and accountable to these standards.</p>

	<p>In our classroom and clinics we teach sanitation and infection control and professional practices that protect public safety. These skills are critical when working closely with members of the public.</p> <p>As an educator, I see firsthand the impact that clear licensing requirements and regulatory structure have on students. Many of them are pursuing barbering as a pathway to stable careers, entrepreneurship, and community service. The structure provided by the Barber and Cosmetology Act helps protect both professionals and the clients we serve.</p> <p>I encourage thoughtful consideration of the impact this legislation will have on our industry, our schools, and the thousands of professionals who rely on clear standards and oversight in order to practice safely and responsibly.</p> <p>The Barber and Cosmetology act provides the structure that helps protect both professionals as well as the clients we serve. Licensing standards and proper training ensure that people entering this industry are prepared and work safely and responsibly.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective and for your work supporting the health, safety, and professional standards of Colorado’s barbering and cosmetology community.</p>
<p>Marisol Espinoza Amend Emily Griffith Technical College</p>	<p>Chair and Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Marisol Espinoza, and I am a licensed barber and barber instructor in Colorado with over 25 years of experience in the barbering and cosmetology industry. I currently teach and mentor future barbers, preparing them to enter a licensed profession that prioritizes sanitation, safety, and professional standards.</p> <p>I am here today regarding HB26-1181, the Sunset Barber and Cosmetology Act.</p>

	<p>Barbering and cosmetology are professions that require hands-on skills, sanitation knowledge, and an understanding of public health. In our classrooms and training clinics, we teach students not only how to cut hair, but also how to properly disinfect tools, prevent the spread of infections, and safely serve the public. Licensing and regulatory oversight help ensure that professionals entering this industry are properly trained and accountable to these standards.</p> <p>In our classroom and clinics we teach sanitation and infection control and professional practices that protect public safety. These skills are critical when working closely with members of the public.</p> <p>As an educator, I see firsthand the impact that clear licensing requirements and regulatory structure have on students. Many of them are pursuing barbering as a pathway to stable careers, entrepreneurship, and community service. The structure provided by the Barber and Cosmetology Act helps protect both professionals and the clients we serve.</p> <p>I encourage thoughtful consideration of the impact this legislation will have on our industry, our schools, and the thousands of professionals who rely on clear standards and oversight in order to practice safely and responsibly.</p> <p>The Barber and Cosmetology act provides the structure that helps protect both professionals as well as the clients we serve. Licensing standards and proper training ensure that people entering this industry are prepared and work safely and responsibly.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective and for your work supporting the health, safety, and professional standards of Colorado’s barbering and cosmetology community.</p>
Miranda Marhofer	As someone who is an instructor and director in a school, I hear and see all of the good and bad. Estheticians receive more understanding

<p>Amend Beautiful You Skincare Academy</p>	<p>than ANYONE of the skin and are more qualified than basic cosmos. All of the rules and regs need to be more clearly defined- but nothing should be taken away whatsoever. Especially with advanced treatments- that is going to cause a rise in unqualified and unlicensed people doing anything they want. This bill will in turn create more chaos and unlicensed people, and out of scope practicing.</p>
<p>Kat DeJesus Against themselves</p>	<p>My name is Kat DeJesus.</p> <p>I am a Colorado makeup artist and educator with more than twenty five years of professional experience, including over eighteen years working in Illinois under a licensed regulatory framework with narrowly defined entertainment industry exemptions. I have worked in retail, bridal, commercial, fashion, and television makeup and have contributed to esthetics educational materials used in state board preparation. My work includes education on sanitation, infection control, and scope of practice standards. My perspective comes from both professional practice and industry education.</p> <p>I respectfully submit testimony regarding House Bill 26-1181 and the proposed exemption for individuals providing makeup application services.</p> <p>Makeup artistry is creative work, but artistic services do not remove public health responsibility when a service involves direct contact with the skin, eyes, and mucous membranes. Makeup is applied to living tissue using tools and products that may be used across multiple clients.</p> <p>Sanitation standards have never limited artistry in my experience. Professional makeup artists create innovative work while still following infection control protocols. When services involve direct contact with the skin and eyes, public safety must remain the stronger priority.</p>

	<p>In practice, makeup application rarely occurs without some level of skin preparation. Artists often cleanse the skin, apply skin care, remove excess oil, sometimes remove facial hair or tweeze brows, and apply lash adhesive near the eye. These activities overlap with services regulated under esthetic or cosmetology scope.</p> <p>Licensed professionals are trained to recognize contagious and infectious skin conditions and deny service when necessary, helping prevent cross contamination and protect clients. We will not have that same standard to protect the general public without it.</p> <p>Exempting makeup services would allow direct skin services to be performed without standardized sanitation or infection control education. Maintaining licensure preserves clear scope boundaries and protects Colorado consumers while still meeting the goal of least restrictive regulation consistent with public safety.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
<p>Mercy Haymaker None themselves</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am a licensed esthetician in Colorado, and I am writing today to voice my testimonial. I support keeping the Cosmetology Act in place for the Cosmetology and Barbering industry. However, I do not support the removal of the Barber and Cosmetology Board Advisory Committee. Let me explain. As an esthetician, my work goes much deeper than just applying products to the skin and helping people relax. Working with the skin is incredibly transformative, scientifically backed, and delicate work. Without nuanced understanding, people can experience serious harm and damage. This nuance is a non-negotiable.</p> <p>Not providing licensure is lazy and will subject the unknowing public to harm. I cannot justify this harm, when we have no reason to remove the licensure we have in place currently.</p> <p>On the other hand, removing the Advisory Committee, would rip any voice that current license holders have away. This is already a major concern that many licensed individuals in the industry have. Without our advisory board - who understands the extreme nuance the</p>

	<p>beauty industry has - the potential for decisions to be made on our behalf without any consulting voice of the industry is a major threat. How will these affect our future regulations? How will this harm our industry? Who will hear us, and how? Without our Advisory Committee, how do we communicate the nuance required to provide safe, exceptional service? The Advisory Committee is in place for our industry's safety, to act as our megaphone. Taking away our licensure is just as harmful as taking away our voices. I urge you to reconsider this Act. I urge you to separate the vastly different concepts of licensure and committee, or I fear this industry would be changed for the worst.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>Ariel Herrera Against themselves</p>	<p>To: Members of the House Committee From: Ariel Herrera Owner of Herrera beauty co Date: March 5, 2026 Subject: Respectful Testimony Regarding HB 26-1181 and Makeup Services</p> <p>I am writing to respectfully submit my testimony regarding HB 26-1181 and the proposed exemption for individuals providing makeup application services. As the owner of Herrerabeautyco, I believe that while makeup artistry is a deeply creative field, artistic freedom should never come at the expense of public health.</p> <p>When a service involves direct contact with a client's skin, eyes, and mucous membranes, sanitation isn't a limitation—it's a professional requirement. In my experience, professional standards have never stifled my creativity; they simply ensure that our "living canvas" remains safe. We use tools and products across multiple clients, and without standardized protocols, the risk of cross-contamination is high.</p> <p>Furthermore, makeup application rarely exists in a vacuum. In practice, it almost always involves skin preparation, the application of skincare, oil removal, and often brow grooming or lash adhesives—activities that clearly overlap with regulated esthetic and cosmetology scopes. Licensed professionals are uniquely trained to</p>

	<p>recognize contagious or infectious skin conditions and deny service when necessary to protect the public.</p> <p>Exempting these services would allow direct-to-skin contact to be performed without the foundation of standardized infection control education. To protect Colorado consumers and maintain clear industry boundaries, I urge the committee to keep licensure requirements in place. Maintaining these standards meets the goal of least restrictive regulation while ensuring public safety remains the priority.</p>
<p>Katherine Bradford Against themselves</p>	<p>To the Members of the Committee,</p> <p>I am a licensed cosmetologist in the State of Colorado and I respectfully submit this testimony in opposition to the repeal of the Cosmetology Advisory Board and to the proposed exemptions that would allow unlicensed individuals to perform cosmetology services.</p> <p>The Cosmetology Advisory Board plays an important role in supporting effective regulation and protecting public health. Licensed cosmetologists work in close physical contact with clients while using tools, implements, and chemical products that require training in sanitation, disinfection, infection control, and the recognition of contagious conditions. An advisory board made up of experienced professionals provides valuable industry expertise and practical insight to the Director when shaping rules and policy. Eliminating this body removes an important source of informed guidance and professional accountability within the regulatory process.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the proposed exemptions that would allow unlicensed individuals to perform services such as hairstyling and makeup application. Licensure is not simply a credential; it represents verified education and competency in infection control, safe tool use, proper sanitation practices, and consumer protection standards. These principles are foundational to protecting the health and safety of the public.</p>

	<p>Even services that may appear simple involve close contact with the skin, hair, and personal tools. Without proper training in sanitation and disinfection practices, there is an increased risk of spreading bacterial, fungal, or viral infections. Members of the public reasonably assume that individuals offering cosmetology services have met state licensing requirements and have received the training necessary to perform those services safely.</p> <p>Additionally, licensed professionals in Colorado invest significant time and financial resources to complete their education, pass examinations, and comply with regulatory standards. Allowing unlicensed individuals to perform the same or similar services creates an uneven regulatory framework and undermines the value of professional licensure.</p> <p>Cosmetology regulation exists to protect the health and safety of Colorado residents. I respectfully urge the committee to maintain the Cosmetology Advisory Board and to reject exemptions that would allow unlicensed individuals to perform cosmetology services.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
<p>Kandiss Carbajal Against themselves</p>	<p>To the Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Kandiss Carbajal, and I work in the cosmetology industry in Colorado. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed exemptions that would allow certain cosmetology services to be performed without a professional license, particularly the exemption related to permanent makeup.</p> <p>Permanent makeup procedures involve breaking the surface of the skin and implanting pigment into the dermal layer. Because these procedures involve needles, blood exposure, and direct contact with the skin, they carry a higher risk for infection, cross-contamination, and disease transmission if not performed under proper sanitation and safety standards. These are not simply cosmetic services; they are</p>

	<p>procedures that require careful training in infection control, sanitation, and client safety.</p> <p>Licensed professionals receive formal education in sanitation, disinfection, bloodborne pathogens, and the proper handling and disposal of tools and materials. These principles are essential for protecting the health of clients. Allowing individuals to perform permanent makeup without requiring a license raises concerns about whether consistent training and safety standards will be maintained.</p> <p>I am also concerned that exemptions allowing unlicensed individuals to perform cosmetology-related services more broadly could create confusion for consumers. Members of the public often assume that individuals providing these types of services have completed professional training and meet state licensing requirements. When exemptions are created, that assumption may no longer be true, which could place consumers at greater risk.</p> <p>Colorado’s licensing system exists to establish minimum standards for education, safety, and professional accountability. Licensed professionals invest significant time and resources to complete their training and meet these standards. Maintaining consistent requirements helps protect both consumers and the integrity of the profession.</p> <p>For these reasons, I respectfully ask the committee to carefully reconsider the proposed exemptions, particularly those related to permanent makeup procedures, and to ensure that appropriate training and oversight remain in place to protect public health and safety.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration</p>
--	---

Good afternoon Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Lauren Bitz, and I am a licensed professional in Colorado's beauty industry. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed exemptions in this bill.

While I appreciate the effort to review and update these regulations, I must respectfully oppose this bill unless amendments are made to address several provisions that weaken consumer protections and professional licensing standards.

Several of the proposed exemptions raise concerns because they could unintentionally weaken those consumer protections.

One area of concern involves exemptions that could allow volunteers or unlicensed individuals to perform services such as shampooing hair, cutting hair, nail polishing, or hair styling. Any form of hair or nail services performed without proper licensure undermines the regulatory framework designed to protect consumers.

Even when services are described as "volunteer," the presence of tip jars or voluntary compensation can blur the line between volunteer work and professional services. It also creates uncertainty around accountability if a client experiences injury, infection, or other adverse outcomes.

Licensed professionals are trained to safely use tools such as nail nippers, e-files, and other implements that can easily break the skin if used improperly. Improper use by untrained individuals increases the risk of cuts, bleeding, infection, and long-term harm. Licensed professionals are also required to carry professional liability insurance and operate under regulatory oversight. Unlicensed individuals are not held to those same standards.

Another concern is the exemption allowing individuals to prepare hair color for clients to use at home. Hair color is a chemical service that requires professional assessment, formulation, and monitoring. Licensed professionals evaluate hair history, scalp condition, porosity, and previous chemical services before formulating color.

Without clarification, the term "home color" could allow nonprofessionals to mix or prepare professional-grade chemical products without the training required to safely handle them. Professional color services differ significantly from box color, which uses generalized formulas designed for broad use. Clear definitions are necessary to prevent misuse and protect consumers from chemical burns, scalp injury, or severe hair damage.

Microblading and permanent makeup are another area of concern. These services should remain under permanent makeup regulations and not be shifted under tattoo artist exemptions.

Permanent makeup and microblading are cosmetic facial procedures that require specialized training beyond general body art or tattooing. In Colorado, licensed estheticians and

cosmetologists must complete at least 132 hours of permanent makeup training to perform these services.

This training includes facial anatomy, pigment behavior, facial symmetry, contraindications, sanitation, and complication management. These procedures are performed on highly visible facial areas, where improper placement or technique can result in permanent cosmetic disfigurement.

Tattoo regulations in Colorado primarily focus on infection control within body art facilities and are typically governed at the county level. They do not require the same standardized cosmetic training necessary to safely perform permanent makeup procedures. Reclassifying these services under tattoo regulations would weaken the current education and competency standards that exist to protect consumers.

Makeup services also present important sanitation considerations. Makeup application involves direct contact with the skin, eyes, and mucous membranes, which creates a significant risk for cross-contamination if proper sanitation practices are not followed.

Licensed professionals are trained in infection control, proper brush sanitation, single-use applicators, and recognizing contraindications such as infections or skin conditions. While retail employees may demonstrate products in a store setting, providing makeup services for compensation — such as weddings, events, photography, or media work — is a professional cosmetic service that should require licensure.

Without licensure requirements, individuals performing these services may not be trained in sanitation or infection control, increasing the risk of bacterial or viral transmission such as conjunctivitis or other infections.

Another important consideration is the removal of the advisory committee. The advisory committee provides essential subject matter expertise that informs regulatory decisions affecting public safety and workforce standards. It creates a structured way for licensed professionals and industry experts to provide input and ensure that regulatory decisions reflect real-world practice and safety considerations. Removing this committee eliminates an important mechanism for accountability and informed decision-making.

Finally, expanding exemptions for services such as makeup application, nail polishing, or hair styling creates an uneven regulatory environment. Licensed professionals are required to complete extensive education, pass state examinations, and comply with ongoing regulatory standards designed to protect public safety. Allowing unlicensed individuals to perform the same services without those requirements undermines the integrity of Colorado's licensing framework and creates unfair competition.

Licensed professionals have invested significant time, education, and financial resources to meet Colorado's standards. Maintaining clear licensure requirements protects consumers, preserves professional standards, and ensures that individuals performing these services have the education and competency necessary to do so safely.

For these reasons, I respectfully oppose the bill unless amendments are made to address these concerns and maintain the safety standards currently in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lauren Bitz, LE

My name is Linda Troute, and I'm a licensed Esthetician and retired educator in Colorado. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed exemptions in this bill.

Professional licensure in our industry exists to protect the public. Licensed professionals complete hundreds of hours of education and training in sanitation, infection control, and safe service practices before we are legally allowed to work on clients.

Several of the proposed exemptions raise concerns because they could weaken those consumer protections.

One concern is allowing volunteers or unlicensed individuals to perform services such as shampooing hair, cutting hair, nail polishing, or styling hair. Even when services are described as "volunteer," it can blur the line between volunteer work and professional services and create confusion about accountability if someone is injured or experiences an infection.

Who is responsible for liability insurance, the volunteer or the spa/ shop owner?

Who is responsible for any injuries that may occur?

As a client, how will I know my service is done by licensed Cosmetologist, Esthetician or Barber or a volunteer? I would feel deceived if I later found out that the volunteer had no licensure, professional training, liability insurance or experience. Who is protecting our clients who may not realize that their provider is voluntarily providing services? Lots of what-ifs!

Licensed professionals are trained to safely use tools and products that can cause injury if used improperly. Without proper training and oversight, there is a higher risk of cuts, infections, chemical burns, or other preventable harm.

Another concern is the language around preparing hair color for home use. Hair color is a chemical service that requires proper assessment and monitoring. Without clear definitions, this language could allow untrained individuals to mix or handle professional chemical products without the education required to do so safely.

There are also concerns about shifting microblading and permanent makeup under tattoo regulations. These are cosmetic facial procedures that require specialized training and should remain under the current professional licensing framework to ensure proper education and safety standards.

Makeup services also involve sanitation and infection control considerations. While retail product demonstrations are common, providing makeup services for compensation—such as weddings or events—is a professional service that should require licensure to protect clients.

Finally, the advisory committee plays an important role in providing industry expertise to regulators. Maintaining this committee helps ensure that regulatory decisions are informed by professionals who understand the safety standards and real-world practices of the industry.

Licensed professionals invest significant time, education, and financial resources to meet Colorado's licensing requirements. Maintaining clear licensure standards protects consumers, supports professional accountability, and preserves the integrity of our industry.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Testimony in Opposition to House Bill 26-1181

To: Members of the House Business Affairs & Labor Committee

From: Kelley Berzinskas, Licensed Cosmetologist & Barber

Date: 03-04-2026

RE: Opposition to HB 26-1181 – Concerning the Continuation of the "Barber and Cosmetologist Act"

Distinguished Members of the Committee,

My name is Kelley Berzinskas, and I have been a licensed cosmetologist in Colorado for 23 years. I am writing today to express my strong opposition to several key provisions within House Bill 26-1181. While I support the 11-year extension of the "Barber and Cosmetologist Act" to ensure the continued stability of our industry, I believe this bill as currently drafted undermines professional standards and compromises public safety.

I urge you to consider the following points of concern from the perspective of a dedicated industry professional:

1. The Repeal of the Advisory Committee (Section 3)

The bill proposes to repeal the six-member advisory committee that currently assists the Director. This committee is essential because it requires the inclusion of at least three licensees with technical expertise and a representative from a licensed school. Removing this body eliminates the only formal mechanism for peer review and expert technical input in our regulation. Entrusting the Director to "review, revise, and update" professional examinations without a mandate to consult with industry experts is a step toward disconnected and potentially ineffective regulation.

2. Broad and Risky Exemptions (Section 6)

The proposed exemptions for "Limited Beauty Services" are particularly alarming. Under this bill, individuals would be allowed to clean and style hair using electrical implements, apply makeup, and polish nails without any licensure or formal training in sanitation and cross-contamination.

Public Health Risks: Our licensing training focuses heavily on identifying scalp diseases, preventing the spread of bloodborne pathogens, and proper chemical safety. Allowing unlicensed individuals to use heat tools and perform nail services on the public creates a significant health risk that the bill does not adequately address.

Market Dilution: Licensed professionals have invested thousands of dollars and hours in education to provide these services safely. Allowing unlicensed "pop-up" services to compete without the same regulatory overhead devalues the professional license.

3. Expansion of Definitions Without Oversight (Section 5)

The bill expands the definition of cosmetology and esthetics to include services like "body wraps" and "hair extensions". While these are modern industry standards, bringing them into the

legal scope of practice while simultaneously removing the expert Advisory Committee creates a regulatory gap. Without expert input, the state may struggle to set appropriate safety and training standards for these more invasive body treatments.

4. Focus on Health and Safety in Exams (Section 4)

While I agree that examinations must emphasize health and safety, I am concerned that the removal of the Advisory Committee will result in exams that overlook technical proficiency. A cosmetologist must not only be "safe" but also "competent." Without experts helping to draft these exams, the barrier to entry may be lowered to a point where the title of "Licensed Cosmetologist" no longer signifies professional skill.

Conclusion

I ask the Committee to amend HB 26-1181 to reinstate the Advisory Committee and remove the exemptions for unlicensed hair styling, makeup, and nail services. We must ensure that "protection of the public" remains the primary goal of this Act, and that can only be achieved through rigorous training and expert oversight.

Thank you for your time and for your service to the State of Colorado.

Sincerely,

Kelley Berzinskas
COS.0046835, BAR.0714207