

**From:** [Brandon Beachy](#)  
**To:** [NASAA Comments](#); [Theresa Leets](#); [bill.beatty@dfi.wa.gov](mailto:bill.beatty@dfi.wa.gov); [Erin Houston](#)  
**Cc:** [Jeff Elgin](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]NASAA Model Franchise Broker Act Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:48:56 PM

---

To Whom It May Concern,

I spent the first part of my career as a professional athlete, and like many in that position, I faced the difficult challenge of transitioning into life after sports. For the past 5+ years I've been a franchisee myself, and for the last 3 years I've also served as a franchise consultant. I got into this industry to be a trusted advocate for people like me—those who want to take control of their futures through entrepreneurship, but who need guidance to do it responsibly. Over the years, I've had the privilege of helping individuals and families explore business ownership in ways that fit their goals, values, and financial realities.

Because of that background, I feel strongly that the proposed rule as written creates unnecessary confusion and harm—without meaningfully helping franchise buyers.

In my role, I don't sell franchises. I am providing a service to my professional fraternity, other pro athletes. I do not care whether they buy a franchise or not, or which one. I provide leads and introductions—just like an advertising platform or a website such as the IFA, Entrepreneur.com, Facebook, or LinkedIn. Once that introduction is made, the franchisor's own sales team (whether employees or FSOs) is solely responsible for the sales process. The current definition of "franchise broker," which attempts to capture anyone "indirectly" involved in sales, is far too broad. If left unchanged, it will sweep in legitimate referral sources like mine who are not engaged in sales at all. That would be an unintended consequence with real negative impacts.

Franchise sales professionals are already regulated by the FTC Franchise Rule and, in some states, by additional requirements. Piling on another layer of registration and compliance will only add cost and bureaucracy without delivering additional protections for prospective franchisees.

If individual states are allowed to create their own rules, fees, and disclosure processes, compliance becomes an impossible maze. For small operators like me, the administrative burden would be overwhelming. If more oversight is truly necessary, it should be handled consistently at the federal level by the FTC, not left to fifty different

interpretations.

From my perspective, these proposals create more problems than they solve.

- The definition of “franchise broker” would capture people who simply make referrals or provide information, not those truly engaged in sales.
- The compliance burden would hit small businesses the hardest, forcing some out of the industry entirely.
- Existing laws already address fraud and misrepresentation—what we need is enforcement, not redundant regulation.

I believe in responsible franchising. I believe in protecting prospective owners from fraud and misleading practices. But this rule, as written, misses the mark. I urge you to narrow the definition of “franchise broker,” avoid duplicative and costly requirements, and ensure any additional oversight is handled uniformly by the FTC at the federal level.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,

**Brandon Beachy**

FranChoice, Inc. - Consultant

615-962-3034 – [Bbeachy@FranChoice.com](mailto:Bbeachy@FranChoice.com)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.