

Date of Hearing: April 14, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH
Mia Bonta, Chair
AB 2244 (Gabriel) – As Amended April 6, 2026

SUBJECT: California Certified food standard.

SUMMARY: Requires the State Department of Public Health (DPH), no later than June 1, 2028, to accredit certification agents that can certify products as “California Certified.” Prohibits an accredited certification agent from certifying a product as “California Certified” if it is classified as an ultraprocessed food (UPF), ultraprocessed food of concern (UPF of concern), or a restricted school food. Requires DPH to create a specified standardized “California Certified” seal. Authorizes a person to use the seal on a product only if the product has been certified by an accredited certification agent. Requires a food facility with gross annual store sales of more than \$10,000,000 to prominently display, as defined, at least 3 or more “California Certified” items if the food facility offers for sale more than 25 certified items. Authorizes DPH, among other parties, to enjoin a food facility that fails to meet these requirements. Specifically, **this bill:**

“California Certified” Seal Accreditation

- 1) Requires DPH to accredit certification agents that can certify products as California Certified pursuant to this bill no later than June 1, 2028.
- 2) Requires an accredited certification agent to do all of the following:
 - a) Register with DPH on a form provided by DPH;
 - b) Annually renew the registration, unless the certification agency is no longer engaged in certifying products pursuant to this bill; and,
 - c) Provide a list to DPH of all the products certified by the accredited certification agent.
- 3) Requires any registration information submitted by an accredited certification agent to DPH to be made available to the public for inspection and copying.
- 4) Requires an accredited certification agent that certifies products sold as “California Certified” to immediately make the following records available for inspection by and to provide a copy to DPH upon request within three business days or within a reasonable time exceeding three business days as determined by DPH, provide a copy to DPH:
 - a) Records obtained from applicants for certification of a product; and,
 - b) Records created by the accredited certification agent regarding applications for certification of a product.
- 5) Authorizes DPH to audit the accredited certification agent’s certification procedures and records at any time, but requires any records of the accredited certification agent not otherwise required to be disclosed to be kept confidential by DPH.

- 6) Requires DPH to maintain a public internet webpage that lists all of the products currently certified as “California Certified” as reported by the accredited certification agent.
- 7) Prohibits an accredited certification agent from certifying a product as “California Certified” if it is classified as any of the following:
 - a) An ultraprocessed food, as defined in 3) of existing law below.
 - b) An ultraprocessed food of concern, as defined in 5) of existing law.
 - c) A restricted school food, as defined in 6) of existing law.
- 8) Requires a product to be recertified as “California Certified” no less frequently than every three years.
- 9) Requires, if a product using the “California Certified” seal is reformulated, an applicant for certification of a product to submit an application to the accredited certification agent within 30 days for recertification of the reformulated product.
- 10) Requires DPH to create a standardized seal that may incorporate both of the following:
 - a) The phrase “California Certified Not Ultraprocessed Food Standard.”
 - b) Images and themes associated with California and healthy, nutritious whole foods.
- 11) Authorizes a person to use the “California Certified” seal on a product only if the product has been certified by an accredited certification agent pursuant to this bill.
- 12) Authorizes the seal to be placed on the principal display panel, the information panel, or elsewhere on the package, provided that the seal does not obscure other required information, such as the nutrition facts panel or the statement of identity.
- 13) Makes it unlawful for a person to certify products as “California Certified” unless duly registered as an accredited certification agent.
- 14) Makes it unlawful for a person to willfully make a false statement or representation, or knowingly fail to disclose a fact required to be disclosed, in registration as an accredited certification agent pursuant to this article.
- 15) Makes it unlawful for a person to willfully make a false statement or representation, or knowingly fail to disclose a fact required to be disclosed to an accredited certification agent.
- 16) Makes it unlawful for a person to use the California Certified seal on a product that does not meet the provisions of this bill.
- 17) Authorizes specified entities to enjoin a person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in the misuse of the California Certified seal in a court of competent jurisdiction. These entities include:
 - a) DPH;

- b) The Attorney General, county counsel, city attorney, or city prosecutor in a city having a full-time city prosecutor in the name of the people of the State of California; and,
- c) A consumer, business entity, or non-profit organization.

18) Specifies that violation of these provisions is not subject to the penalties of the Sherman Act.

Preferred Placement

- 19) Requires a food facility with gross annual store sales of more than \$10,000,000 to prominently display, as defined, at least 3 or more “California Certified” items if the food facility offers for sale more than 25 certified items.
- 20) Authorizes specified entities to enjoin a food facility that fails to meet the requirements of this bill in a court of competent jurisdiction. These entities include:
- a) DPH;
 - b) The Attorney General, county counsel, city attorney, or city processor in a city having a full-time city prosecutor in the name of the people of the State of California; and,
 - c) A consumer, business entity, or non-profit organization.
- 21) Specifies that violation of these provisions is not subject to the enforcement provisions of the California Retail Food Code (CRFC).
- 22) States the intent of the Legislature to provide consumers with reliable and easily accessible health-related information so that they can make informed choices when purchasing food and beverages.
- 23) Defines the following for purposes of this bill:
- a) “Accredited certification agent” to mean an entity accredited by the department to certify products as “California Certified,”; and,
 - b) “California Certified” to mean a product that has been certified by an accredited certification agent.
- 24) Finds and declares that the portion of this bill relating to the “California Certified” Seal accreditation imposes a limitation on the public’s right of access to the meetings of public bodies or the writings of public officials and agencies within the meaning of Section 3 of Article I of the California Constitution. Pursuant to that constitutional provision, the Legislature makes the following findings to demonstrate the interest protected by this limitation and the need for protecting that interest: To ensure protection for confidential and proprietary business information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets, requires any records of the accredited certification agent not otherwise required to be disclosed to be kept confidential by DPH.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the Sherman Law, which provides for the regulation of various subjects relating to the processing, labeling, advertising, and sale of food, drugs, and cosmetics, including dietary supplements, under the administration and enforcement of DPH. [Health & Safety Code (HSC) § 109875, *et seq.*]
- 2) Requires a person who violates the Sherman Law or regulations adopted pursuant to the Sherman Law, if convicted, to be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year in a county jail or a fine of not more than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or both the imprisonment and fine. [HSC § 111825]
- 3) Defines “UPF” to mean any food or beverage that contains a substance (including surface-active agents, stabilizers and thickeners, propellants, colors, emulsifiers, flavoring agents, flavor enhancers, and nonnutritive agents as specified in federal regulations) and either high amounts of saturated fat, sodium, or added sugar or a nonnutritive sweetener as defined in federal regulations or other substance, as specified. [HSC § 104661]
- 4) Specifies that UPF does not include the following: a commodity food specifically made available by the United States Department of Agriculture; a raw agricultural commodity; an unprocessed locally grown or locally raised agricultural product; a minimally processed prepared food, Class 1 milk, alcoholic beverages, medical foods only if exempted by the department by regulation; and infant formula, as specified. [*Ibid.*]
- 5) Defines “restricted school foods” to mean a food or beverage product that is not listed in 4) above, that contains one or more of the substances specified in 3) above, and that is restricted from service or sale in schools, as defined by the regulations adopted by DPH consistent with 7) below. [HSC § 104662]
- 6) Defines “UPF of concern” to mean a food or food product that is an ultraprocessed food, as defined in 3) above, that is of concern, as determined by regulations consistent with 7) below. [HSC § 104662]
- 7) Requires DPH to adopt regulations, on or before June 1, 2028, to define “ultraprocessed foods of concern” and “restricted school foods,” as specified, and requires DPH, when defining ultraprocessed foods of concern and restricted school foods, to consider several specified factors, including whether the substance or group of substances are banned or restricted in other state, federal, or international jurisdictions due to concerns about adverse health consequences. [HSC § 104662]
- 8) Establishes the CRFC) to provide for the regulation of retail food facilities. Establishes health and sanitation standards at the state level through the CRFC, while enforcement is charged to local agencies, carried out by the 58 county environmental health departments and four city environmental health departments (Berkeley, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Vernon). [HSC § 113700, *et seq.*]
- 9) Defines, within the CRFC, a “food facility” to mean an operation that stores, prepares, packages, serves, vends, or otherwise provides food for human consumption at the retail level, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a) An operation where food is consumed on or off the premises, regardless of whether there is a charge for the food; and,
 - b) A place used in conjunction with the operations described in 9) a) above, including but not limited to storage facilities for food-related utensils, equipment and materials. [HSC § 113789]
- 10) Specifies that “food facility” includes permanent and nonpermanent food facilities, including, but not limited to, the following:
- a) Public and private school cafeterias;
 - b) Restricted food service facilities;
 - c) Licensed health care facilities, except as specified;
 - d) Commissaries;
 - e) Mobile food facilities;
 - f) Mobile support units;
 - g) Temporary food facilities;
 - h) Vending machines;
 - i) Certified farmers’ markets, for purposes of permitting and enforcement;
 - j) Farm stands, for purposes of permitting and enforcement;
 - k) Fishermen’s markets;
 - l) Microenterprise home kitchen operations;
 - m) Catering operation; and,
 - n) Host facility. [HSC § 113789 (c)]

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill has not been analyzed by a fiscal committee.

COMMENTS:

- 1) PURPOSE OF THIS BILL.** According to the author, this bill would establish a “Not Ultraprocessed” seal that food manufacturers could place on products that meet clear standards for not being ultra-processed. Modeled after the “USDA Organic” label, the seal would provide consumers with a simple, trustworthy way to identify healthier options with a quick glance. The author further notes that this bill would require grocery stores in California to feature products bearing the seal in a prominent, high-traffic area of the store, thereby making it easier for busy families to locate healthier foods quickly and conveniently. The author concludes that ultimately, parents shouldn’t need a Ph.D. to understand what they’re

feeding their kids, and this bill will empower consumers with clear, trustworthy information and make it easier for them to find foods that are free from harmful additives.

- 2) **BACKGROUND.** The term UPF was first introduced in a scientific context in 2009 as part of the NOVA classification system. The NOVA classification system characterizes foods based on their level of industrial processing (such as whole food fractioning, chemical modification, assembly, additions for palatability, and packaging), with four categories ranging from unprocessed/minimally processed foods to UPF. According to a 2019 article published in *Public Health Nutrition* titled “Ultraprocessed foods: what they are and how to identify them,” the UPF category is characterized by food products which are formulations of ingredients, mostly of exclusive industrial use, that result from a series of industrial processes. According to the aforementioned article, common examples of UPFs include confectionery, sodas, packaged breads and reconstituted meat products (for example, hot dogs). The article notes that another practical way to identify UPFs is to examine whether listed ingredients contain substances rarely used in home kitchens (for example, hydrogenated oils) and/or include additives to enhance food palatability or appearance (for example, sweeteners).

A 2024 article published in *Foods* (a peer-reviewed scientific journal) titled “UPF Intake and Increased Risk of Obesity: A Narrative Review” notes that UPF consumption correlates with adverse health outcomes, including but not limited to overweight, obesity, and hypertension and insulin resistance. The article further states that UPFs, prevalent in modern diets, contribute to nutritional deficiencies and excessive caloric intake, exacerbating obesity rates. Lifestyle factors such as busy schedules and quick meal management further drive UPF consumption, disrupting hunger regulation and promoting overeating.

a) State Level Efforts to Reduce the Impact of UPFs.

- i) **Governor’s Executive Order (EO) on UPFs.** On January 1, 2025, Governor Gavin Newsom issued an EO related to UPFs. Among other provisions, the EO required DPH to provide recommendations to the Governor’s Office regarding potential action to limit the harms associated with UPFs and food ingredients that pose a health risk to individuals and stated that such recommendations may include, but are not necessarily limited to, requiring the inclusion of warning labels for certain UPFs. Additionally, the EO required specific state agencies to do the following:
- (1) Continue investigating the adverse health impacts of synthetic food dyes;
 - (2) Recommend actions to reduce the purchase of soda, candy, other UPFs and/or foods with synthetic food dye or other additives;
 - (3) Investigate the feasibility of requiring Medi-Cal Managed Care plans and California hospitals to use their Community Investment dollars and Community Benefit funds to enhance access to fresh, healthy foods, mitigate the impacts of “food deserts,” and otherwise promote public health at the local level;
 - (4) Identify areas where California may adopt higher standards for healthy school meals than national standards; and,

- (5) Explore developing new standards and partnerships to further protect and expand universal school food programs.
- ii) AB 1264 (Gabriel), Chapter 467, Statutes of 2025 defined UPFs, UPFs of concern, and restricted school foods as specified in existing law above and further required DPH to promulgate regulations to define these terms considering specified factors by June 1, 2028.
- b) **Consumers and UPFs.** A 2024 study of adults living in the United Kingdom titled “Consumer Awareness: Perceptions and Avoidance of UPFs” published in *Foods* found that 73% of participants were aware of the term UPF and 58% reported that their food choices are determined by whether they believe a food is a UPF or not. Participants with the highest income and education levels were most likely to report both being aware of, and, avoiding consuming UPFs. Most participants could not accurately categorize whether foods were UPFs. Some sociodemographic groups (for example, higher education levels) were more likely to accurately categorize UPFs but were also more likely to incorrectly believe that non-UPFs were UPFs. Participants tended to report that UPF-health risk information acts as a deterrent to consuming UPFs.
- The Environmental Working Group, the sponsors of this bill cite a 2025 report from the Food Integrity Collective and Linkage Research titled, “Disconnected: Understanding the Gaps Between Consumer Intentions and Actions on Ultra-Processed Foods (2025),” which found that 72% of Americans are trying to reduce their UPF intake, yet fewer than half could correctly identify common ultra-processed products.
- c) **United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Organic Label.** According to the author, this bill is modeled after the USDA Organic Label. The USDA Organic label indicates that a product meets federal standards for organic farming and processing, including agricultural production practices that foster resource cycling, promote ecological balance, maintain and improve soil and water quality, minimize the use of synthetic materials, and conserve biodiversity. Organic product labels are required to be reviewed and approved by a USDA-accredited certifying agent before being used in the marketplace.
- d) **Impact of Nutrition Labels on Retail Costs.** An article published on the University of Georgia’s website titled “Impact of food nutrition labels on retail pricing and consumer purchasing”, highlighted research on sales of yogurt sold by stores who had adopted NuVal labels (which assigned scores describing the healthfulness of a product) and found that retailers increased prices for healthier products (products with higher NuVal scores), with the implication that people with more money are able to purchase healthier foods, whereas people with less money are more likely to purchase less healthy foods.
- e) **What does this bill do?** This bill does two key things. First, this bill establishes a process overseen by DPH where food manufacturers could apply to accredited certification agents to use a not ultra-processed label on their packaging, thereby indicating that a product is not a UPF as defined in state law. Second, this bill requires grocery stores in California to prominently display products with the not ultra-processed seal in a designated high-traffic area. The enforcement mechanism for both of these provisions is to specified entities to pursue injunctive relief through the courts.

- 3) **SUPPORT.** The Environmental Working Group (EWG) is the sponsor of this bill and states in support that right now, consumers in California have no practical way to identify UPFs at the grocery store, even when they are actively trying to avoid them. EWG continues that consumers want to make better choices, but the information they need is not available to them at the point of purchase. EWG continues that this bill builds on AB 1264's first-in-the-nation UPF definition and creates a voluntary "California Certified" seal administered through DPH-accredited third-party agents, backed by a public product registry, and enforceable by the Attorney General. EWG states that under this bill, no manufacturer is required to participate, and the preferred placement requirement applies only to large retailers already carrying more than 25 certified items. EWG states that unlike existing private certification programs, which operate without government oversight, this seal carries the force of state law and the accountability of a government-backed standard. EWG concludes that the "California Certified" seal is the trusted, reliable signal that consumers need.
- 4) **OPPOSITION.** The California League of Food Producers (CLFP) opposes this bill, stating its most fundamental concern is that this bill builds on a definitional foundation that has not yet been established. CLFP notes that AB 1264 directed DPH to adopt regulations defining "ultraprocessed foods of concern" and "restricted school foods" by June 1, 2028, the same deadline by which this bill would require certification agents to be accredited and operational. CLFP is concerned that a certification system will be in place before the underlying definitions it depends on have been established through a transparent rulemaking process. Additionally, as noted in CLFP's opposition to AB 1264, the broad definition of "ultraprocessed" risks capturing foods that are widely regarded as healthy and nutritious. CLFP further contends that "California Certified" could lead to consumer confusion, as products grown and processed in California have the distinct advantage of being labeled and marketed with California Grown and California Organic seals, prestigious certification labels that require rigorous review. CLFP states that under this bill products that are imported from out of state, or even the country, can receive a "California Certified" label, which could mislead the consumer into thinking that the product is from California and meets the extensive standards that California producers undergo. CLFP states these products would carry a cost advantage, as they are not subject to the same regulatory and environmental requirements as California processors. Further, CLFP concludes by expressing this its concerns with "preferred placement" provision, highlighting a concern that not all qualifying products will receive the same priority or treatment from retailers and many healthy, protein-rich items such as dairy, produce, frozen vegetables and meat products will have limited exposure, as these items require refrigeration or frozen display cases that are not available in the "prominent locations" that this bill contemplates. Many of these products would qualify for the California Certification yet would be unable to access the benefit the bill is designed to provide.
- 5) **OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED.** The California Grocers Association (CGA) and California Retailers Association (CRA), oppose this bill unless amended, stating that product placement, shelving configuration, and in-store displays in retail grocery environments are the result of extensive planning, consumer behavior analysis, and longstanding contractual relationships among retailers, distributors, brokers, and manufacturers and include negotiated slotting fees, promotional agreements, and category management strategies that ensure products are stocked efficiently and presented in ways that meet customer expectations. CGA and CRA further state that these systems are essential to maintaining operational viability in an industry where net profit margins are often just one to two percent, and a state mandate

dictating the placement or display of certain products would disrupt these agreements, create operational inefficiencies, and jeopardize an important source of revenue that helps grocers keep food prices as low as possible. CGA and CRA further state shelf space in grocery stores is finite and intensely competitive and this bill would override retailer decisions by requiring grocers to dedicate valuable shelf space to specific labeled products, regardless of whether those products align with customer purchasing patterns in a given store or community. CGA and CRA contend that if certain product labels trigger mandatory display requirements, retailers may respond by choosing not to carry those labeled products at all in order to avoid the associated compliance burdens and loss of merchandising flexibility, resulting in reduced consumer access to the products this bill seeks to promote. Finally, CGA and CRA state that compliance with this bill would introduce new operational burdens, including staff training, monitoring, and potential enforcement risks. CGA and CRA request an amendment to remove the section of this bill relating to “preferred placement” in its entirety.

- 6) **RELATED LEGISLATION.** AB 2034 (Addis) would require manufacturers of food additives to submit safety information to DPH before using certain food additives that have not undergone federal pre-market review. Would create a public database which includes, among other things, safety information provided by manufacturers. Would require manufacturers to report all ingredients to DPH, including those under the names “natural flavor,” “artificial flavor,” “artificial color,” and “spice,” and requires DPH to create a public, searchable database where consumers can view ingredient information. Would deem a food additive unsafe if it is found to induce cancer. AB 2034 passed the Assembly Health Committee on a 10-3 vote.

7) **PREVIOUS LEGISLATION.**

- a) AB 1264 (Gabriel), Chapter 467, Statutes of 2025 prohibits local educational agencies from selling "particularly harmful ultra-processed foods" or beverages, beginning July 1, 2035. Prohibits a vendor from offering particularly harmful UPF to a school, beginning January 1, 2032. Requires OEHHA to adopt, by July 1, 2026, regulations to define particularly harmful UPF.
- b) AB 2316 (Gabriel), Chapter 914, Statutes of 2024 prohibits schools, commencing December 31, 2027, from serving or selling any food or beverage during the school day that contains the following six synthetic color additives: Blue 1, Blue 2, Green 3, Red 40, Yellow 5, and Yellow 6.
- c) AB 418 (Gabriel), Chapter 328, Statutes of 2023 enacts the California Food Safety Act to prohibit, commencing January 1, 2027, the manufacture or sale of a food product that contains any of the following substances: brominated vegetable oil; potassium bromate; propylparaben; and, red dye 3.
- d) SB 348 (Skinner), Chapter 600, Statutes of 2023 requires schools to provide students with adequate time to eat following guidelines established by the California Department of Education (CDE); makes various conforming changes to the school meal program to implement the free universal school breakfast and lunch program; and, requires the CDE, in partnership with the California School Nutrition Association to develop guidelines to reduce the sugar and sodium content in school meals if the National School Lunch Program allows more added sugar or sodium than is recommended by the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans at any time in the future.

- e) SB 651 (Wieckowski) of 2021 would have required food containing synthetic dyes to have the following label: SAFETY WARNING: Synthetic dyes may cause or worsen behavioral problems in children. SB 651 was not heard in the Senate Health Committee.
- f) SB 347 (Monning) of 2019, SB 300 (Monning) of 2017, SB 203 (Monning) of 2015, and SB 1000 (Monning) of 2014 would have established the Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Health Warning Act, to be administered by DPH, and required a safety warning on all sealed sugar-sweetened beverage containers, as specified. Would have required the warning label to be posted in a place that is easily visible at the point-of-purchase of an establishment where a beverage container is not filled by the consumer. SB 347 was not heard in Assembly Health Committee. SB 300 was not heard in Senate Health Committee. SB 203 failed passage in the Senate Health Committee. SB 1000 failed passage in the Assembly Health Committee.

8) POLICY COMMENT.

- a) **Rising food costs.** According to the 2024 California Health Interview Survey, 47.2% of California adults earning less than 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL) — \$30,120 for a single adult and \$62,400 for a family of four — were food insecure. Concerns have been raised that this bill could increase manufacturing and retail costs which would be passed on to already struggling consumers. As described in the Background above, research has shown that retailers raise prices on products with nutrition labels that make implications about the healthfulness of a product.
- b) **Preferred placement in grocery store.** This bill requires food facilities with gross annual sales of more than \$10 million to prominently display at least three or more “California Certified” items if the food facilities offers for sale more than 25 certified items. Decisions about prominent placement entail careful design and planning as well as contractual relationships between grocery stores and manufacturers. These decisions have impacts on a grocery store’s revenues. Thus, there is concern that requiring prominent placement of items with the California Certified seal will have negative impacts on grocery store profits which could also lead to increased food costs.
- c) **Injunctive Relief.** This bill authorizes DPH, the Attorney General, other public attorneys (county counsel, city attorney or city prosecutor), and consumers, businesses and nonprofit organizations to enjoin a person who has misused the California Certified Seal or a food facility who fails to meet this bill’s preferred placement requirements. Allowing consumers, businesses, and nonprofits to seek injunctions in this manner would function as a private right of action and could potentially lead to frivolous lawsuits. As this bill moves forward, the author is encouraged to consider deleting the authorization for consumers, business entities, and non-profit organizations to pursue injunctive relief.
- d) **Overlapping Timelines.** This bill requires DPH, no later than June 1, 2028, to accredit certification agents that can certify products as “California Certified.” This bill also prohibits accredited certification agents from certifying products as “California Certified” if it is classified as a “UPF,” “UPF of Concern,” or “restricted school food” based on definitions established in AB 1264 described above. The definitions of “UPF of concern” and “restricted school food” rely on regulations adopted by DPH on or before June 1, 2028. Requiring the certification agents to be operational on the same deadline that the DPH is required to establish the definitions that these agents will rely on in doing their

work could create confusion. Moving forward, the author may wish to delay implementation of this bill until six months after the AB 1264 regulations go into effect.

9) AMENDMENTS. The Committee may wish to amend this bill as follows:

- a) Replace the term “California Certified” with “Non-Ultraprocessed Certified.”
- b) Require a food facility to be granted flexibility in identifying a prominent location within their store.
- c) Clarify that this bill does not apply to restaurants and other entities described in 10) of existing law above.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Environmental Working Group (sponsor)
 A Voice for Choice Advocacy
 Active San Gabriel Valley
 Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
 American Diabetes Association
 California Medical Association (CMA)
 California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice
 California Podiatric Medical Association
 Center for Ecoliteracy
 Center for Environmental Health
 Chef Ann Foundation
 Clean Earth 4 Kids
 Consumer Reports
 Crohn’s and Colitis Foundation
 Eat Real
 End Chronic Disease
 Facts Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety
 Friends Committee on Legislation of California
 Mamavation - Non-toxic Products for Healthy Families
 PSR SF Bay Chapter
 United Nurses Associations of California/union of Health Care Professionals
 Wellness in the Schools, Inc.

Opposition

California Chamber of Commerce
 California League of Food Producers
 Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
 Competere - Policies for Sustainable Development

Analysis Prepared by: Eliza Brooks / HEALTH / (916) 319-2097