From: Paul Dunkirk-Greenbaum
To: Patrick McQuillan
Subject: Response to HF1275 Questionnaire A from AMTA
Date: Sunday, February 13, 2022 8:52:49 PM

Hello,
This is in response to HF1275, the massage bill AMTA would like to pass.
My name is Paul Dunkirk-Greenbaum. I've been professionally practicing massage since 2013. At the beginning of the year I received my license from the City of Minneapolis to establish a new massage studio.
Thank you for hearing me and the other small businesses who will be negatively impacted by this bill.

In regards to section 4 a in the questionnaire.
Mn Stat 214.001, subd. 2, declaring that "no regulations shall be imposed upon any occupation unless required for the safety and well being of the citizens of the state." The harm must be "recognizable, and not remote."
I get the sense that AMTA is interested in it's bottom line rather than what is best for Minnesotans as they did not provide proof backing up their claims.
I'm interested to see what cases in Minnesota resulted in client injury or harm given the procedures used by massage therapists during the course of treatment. I haven't heard of any massage therapists in my network harming a client before. How is this harm recognizable and not remote among practitioners in Minnesota? How is the harm greater here than in other states that require licensure through a board?
Massage therapy is already integrated into the healthcare system and there are many effective massage therapists that have been working in it for years. This isn't something new.

In regards to section 6, I feel AMTA makes it clear that it is interested in passing this bill for it's own gain at the expense of massage clients and practioners due to the added financial burden, as there isn't evidence provided of the harm they are claiming and they don't offer any plan to measure the impact if the bill was passed.
It shows to me they're not interested in evidence based data to ensure Minnesotans benefit from this bill and it is greatly concerning.

A similar bill did not pass when it was presented in the past and I don't see the harm done to the public that they are claiming that theoretically might be addressed from licensure from a board.
Please strike this bill down as it does not meet the requirements of Mn Stat 214.001, subd. 2.

Thank you for your time,
Paul Dunkirk-Greenbaum
Elegant Touch Massage