

---

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON  
BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**  
Senator Dr. Aisha Wahab, Chair  
2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	AB 928	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	June 22, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Rogers		
<b>Version:</b>	June 2, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Elissa Silva		

**Subject:** Roosters: restrictions

**SUMMARY:** Prohibits a person from keeping more than 25 roosters that are movement constrained, as specified, beginning January 1, 2028, unless specifically exempt.

**NOTE:** *This bill is double-referred to the Senate Committee on Judiciary, Second.*

**Existing law:**

- 1) States that whenever the Director of the Department of Public Health finds that psittacosis, or any other diseases transmissible to man from pet birds, have become a public health hazard to the extent that control measures are necessary or desirable, the department shall adopt additional regulations as it deems necessary for the public health; and these regulations apply to all pet birds whether or not of a species otherwise regulated under existing laws on Avian Zoonosis Control, as specified. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 121745)
- 2) Prohibits a person from tethering, fastening, chaining, tying, or restraining a dog, to a doghouse, tree, fence, or any other stationary object, except that a person may do the following so long as they do not violate 9):
  - a) Attach a dog to a running line, pulley, or trolley system. A dog shall not be tethered to the running line, pulley, or trolley system by means of a choke collar or pinch collar.
  - b) Tether, fasten, chain, tie, or otherwise restrain a dog pursuant to the requirements of a camping or recreational area.
  - c) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog no longer than is necessary for the person to complete a temporary task that requires the dog to be restrained for a reasonable period.
  - d) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog while engaged in, or actively training for, an activity that is conducted pursuant to a valid license issued by the State of California if the activity for which the license is issued is associated with the use or presence of a dog, as specified.

- e) Tether, fasten, chain, or tie a dog while actively engaged in any of the following:
  - i) Conduct that is directly related to the business of shepherding or herding cattle or livestock.
  - ii) Conduct that is directly related to the business of cultivating agricultural products, if the restraint is reasonably necessary for the safety of the dog. (HSC § 122335(b),(c))
- 3) Regulates, generally, the production of poultry, eggs, and egg products. (Food and Agriculture Code (FAC) §§ 25401-26151)
- 4) Makes any building or property used for the purpose of willfully conducting dog fighting or cockfighting in violation of the Penal Code (PC) a public nuisance. (Civil Code (CIV) § 3482.8)
- 5) States that any minor under 16 years of age who visits or attends any cockfight or place where any cockfight is advertised to take place, and any owner, lessee, or proprietor, or the agent of any owner, lessee, or proprietor of any place where any cockfight is advertised or represented to take place who admits any minor to a place where any cockfight is advertised or represented to take place or who admits, sells, or gives to any minor a ticket by which that minor may be admitted to a place where a cockfight is advertised to take place, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and is punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than 25 days. (PC) § 310(b))
- 6) States that any property interest, whether tangible or intangible, that was acquired through the commission of any of the crimes listed in subdivision related to dog fighting are subject to forfeiture, including both personal and real property, profits, proceeds, and the instrumentalities acquired, accumulated, or used by cockfighting or dogfighting participants, organizers, transporters of animals and equipment, breeders and trainers of fighting birds or fighting dogs, and persons who steal or illegally obtain dogs or other animals for fighting, including bait and sparring animals. (PC § 598.1(b))
- 7) States that a person a person who overdrives, overloads, drives when overloaded, overworks, tortures, torments, deprives of necessary sustenance, drink, or shelter, cruelly beats, mutilates, or cruelly kills an animal, or causes or procures an animal to be so overdriven, overloaded, driven when overloaded, overworked, tortured, tormented, deprived of necessary sustenance, drink, shelter, or to be cruelly beaten, mutilated, or cruelly killed; and whoever, having the charge or custody of an animal, either as owner or otherwise, subjects an animal to needless suffering, or inflicts unnecessary cruelty upon the animal, or in any manner abuses an animal, or fails to provide the animal with proper food, drink, or shelter, or protection from the weather, or who drives, rides, or otherwise uses the animal when unfit for labor, is, for each offense, guilty of a crime, as specified. (PC § 597(b))
- 8) Prohibits any person who, for amusement or gain, causes any cock to fight with another cock or with a different kind of animal or creature or with any human being;

or who, for amusement or gain, worries or injures any cock, or causes any cock to worry or injure another animal; and any person who permits the same to be done on any premises under his or her charge or control, and any person who aids or abets the fighting or worrying of any cock is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for a period not to exceed one year, or by a fine not to exceed \$10,000, or by both that imprisonment and fine. (PC § 597b(b))

- 9) Requires every person who keeps an animal confined in an enclosed area to provide it with an adequate exercise area and requires any leash, rope, or chain, the leash, rope, or chain restricting the animal to be affixed in such a manner that it will prevent the animal from becoming entangled or injured and permit the animal's access to adequate shelter, food, and water, unless the animal is in transit, in a vehicle, or in the immediate control of a person. (PC § 591t)

**This bill:**

- 1) Prohibits a person from keeping more than 25 roosters that are movement constrained through the use of an enclosure or tether beginning on and after January 1, 2028.
- 2) Defines "enclosure" for purposes of this bill to mean a structure used for confinement, including a wire cage or item traditionally used for another purpose such as a water tank or plastic barrel that meets both of the following criteria:
  - a) Is used to provide long-term housing for one rooster:
  - b) Prevents physical contact with other roosters.
- 3) Defines a "gamefowl rooster" to mean a rooster of a breed of domestic fowl chiefly developed or maintained for the purpose of producing fighting cocks, including, but not limited to, all of the following breeds:
  - a) American Gamefowl.
  - b) Asil.
  - c) Other breeds or crossbreeds of rooster intended or used for fighting.
- 4) Defines "Rooster" to mean a male chicken that meets all of the following criteria:
  - a) Is six months of age or older.
  - b) Has full adult plumage.
  - c) Is capable of crowing.
  - d) Is not a bantam chicken.

- 5) States that the following are exempt from the 25-rooster limit as provided in this bill:
  - a) A person who keeps or raises roosters for purposes of food production if the person is subject to local, state, or federal inspection laws or regulations.
  - b) A public or private school registered with the State Department of Education.
  - c) A government-operated animal shelter.
  - d) A nonprofit animal welfare organization, as defined in Section 6010.40 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.
  - e) A 4-H, Future Farmers of America (FFA), or Grange project, if the 4-H, FFA, or Grange has provided written approval for the project to the person keeping or raising the roosters.
  - f) A person who meets the following criteria:
    - i) Owns and breeds poultry for the purpose of lawful exhibition in accordance with accepted poultry raising practices and all laws and regulations governing exhibition.
    - ii) Within the preceding 10 years, has not been convicted for any cockfighting offense pursuant to Section 597b of the Penal Code or Section 2156 of Title 7 of the United States Code, or any other cockfighting offense of any state.
    - iii) Does not possess more than 25 gamefowl roosters.
- 6) Requires before a civil action is brought pursuant to the provision on having more than 25 roosters, where public safety is not at risk, a written notice of violation must be provided granting a minimum of 14 days to correct the violation and to rehome or relinquish the roosters.
- 7) Makes a person who violates the prohibition to be liable for a civil penalty, not to exceed \$2,500 for each violation, which is to be assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General, a county counsel, a city attorney, or a city prosecutor in this state in a court of competent jurisdiction.
- 8) Requires the civil penalties collected pursuant to this chapter shall be paid to the county in which the action was brought.
- 9) Makes each day that a rooster is kept in violation of the 25 limit to constitute a separate and distinct violation.
- 10) States that the provisions of this bill do not prevent a city or county from adopting or enforcing ordinances on the keeping of roosters that are more restrictive than the

provisions of this bill.

- 11) States that the provisions of this bill do not limit or affect the application or enforcement of any other law that protects animals, including, but not limited to, specified provisions of the penal code or any other local, state, or federal law that protects animals.
- 12) Makes findings and declarations related to the problems with illegal cockfighting and the dangers of highly contagious avian influenza.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown. The current version of this bill has not been analyzed by a fiscal committee.

**COMMENTS:**

1. **Purpose.** Humane World for Animals is the sponsor of this bill. According to the Author, "Cockfighting is a criminal industry that profits from severe animal cruelty and often occurs alongside other unlawful activities. Although cockfighting is illegal in every state and under federal law, it continues to be a widespread criminal industry across the country, especially in California. An integral and lucrative part of this industry is the trafficking of fighting birds from gamefowl yards where hundreds (or thousands) of roosters are bred and sold for fighting. These birds are raised outside with minimal shelter, kept in inhumane conditions meant to heighten their aggressive behaviors, and sold for hundreds or thousands of dollars per bird. Illegally trafficked fighting birds are also a threat to the poultry industry and public health given the current and potential impacts of avian flu and other avian diseases. Law enforcement needs more tools to address the prevalence of cockfighting and related activities. AB 928 empowers law enforcement to proactively address this issue by establishing civil liability for those who traffic birds for fighting. The provisions of this bill won't interfere with commercial poultry operations, poultry hobbyists, schools, animal agencies, and FFA and 4H projects. California must continue to lead the fight on animal cruelty and provide law enforcement with effective deterrents, like civil penalties, to stop illegal cockfighting and bird trafficking operations. Modeled after existing California county ordinances, this bill will safeguard local communities from the cruelty, noise, avian disease, and criminal activities linked to cockfighting."

2. **Background.**

*Agricultural Animals.* Agricultural animals are regulated by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) under the Animal Health and Food Safety Services Division. Under current law, all poultry must be inspected by a USDA Category II accredited veterinarian within 30 days of movement into California. The Meat, Poultry and Egg Safety Branch, under the CDFA, licenses and inspects the meat, poultry and egg production establishments that are exempt from federal oversight in California. Non-food pet chickens are not subject to state oversight; however local governments may have animal/pet restrictions or limitations within their jurisdictions.

*Roosters.* A rooster is an adult male chicken. There is a myriad of different breeds of roosters. Roosters are bred for different agricultural purposes, including meat and egg production, ornamental and exhibition, or meat only. Breeds of roosters can include the Rhode Island Red, Silkie, Plymouth Rock, Sussex, and Leghorn, to name a few. Roosters that are typically used in cockfighting are commonly referred to as “gamefowl” and are not one specific breed of rooster but instead are crossbreeds of roosters which are described to be bred specifically with the necessary characteristics for purposes of cockfighting. Rooster breed varieties are described to have similar personalities in that they are leaders of their flock, are protective and can be territorial. The “gamefowl” varieties are noted as being more aggressive and have higher levels of stamina.

*Cockfighting and Animal Cruelty.* According to the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), “Cockfighting is a blood sport in which two roosters specifically bred for aggression are placed beak to beak in a small ring and encouraged to fight to the death.” Cockfighting is illegal in all 50 states and is a felony offense in 42 states and the District of Columbia. The possession of birds for fighting purposes is prohibited in 39 states and the District of Columbia, and being a spectator at a cockfighting event is illegal in 43 states and the District of Columbia. Current federal law makes it unlawful for any person to knowingly sponsor or exhibit an animal in an animal fighting venue; to knowingly buy, sell, possess, train, transport, deliver or receive any animal for the purpose of having the animal participate in an animal fighting venue, and further prohibits the selling, transporting, or purchasing of any knife or other sharp object that attaches to the leg of a bird for use in an animal fighting venture. California makes it only a misdemeanor and subjects certain property acquired in the case of a cockfighting case subject to forfeiture.

According to People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (Peta), “Roosters bred for cockfighting are hatched on “game” farms by breeders known as ‘cockers.’ If a chick doesn’t seem violent enough, he’s killed, and most of the “chosen” birds spend their lives tethered by the leg to a plastic barrel or small cage—their only shelter. Cockers then train the birds to gain strength and endurance by attaching weights and blades to their legs and setting them loose for ‘practice fights’ with each other.” This bill seeks to address the breeding and captivity of those roosters which are raised for purposes of cockfighting.

Information provided by the Author notes that since 2024, California law enforcement agencies have seized more than 5,000 birds, dozens of firearms including “ghost guns”, large quantities of methamphetamine, cocaine, and fentanyl, and arrested at least 83 individuals with many more fleeing the scenes and destroying property and endangering neighbors.

Further, in the past ten years, the five largest cockfighting seizures in United States were all in California:

- Val Verde: 7,000 birds seized in 2017
- Ceres: Nearly 3,000 birds seized by federal authorities in 2019

- Chatsworth: More than 2,000 birds seized in 2020
- San Bernardino County: 3,500 roosters in 2025
- Sonoma County: 833 roosters in 2026

In February 2026, KRON 4 reported on a story out of Sonoma County where over 800 roosters were identified as being a part of a large-scale illegal cockfighting bust. It was reported that all of the rescued roosters had to be euthanized, as they would be unable to be socialized. More recently, in May of 2026, a KCRA 3 news story reported that 18 roosters were taken from an illegal cockfighting event. Almost all roosters seized from cock fighting operations have to be put down because they are not socialized and would likely attack other roosters or birds.

This bill would, beginning January 1, 2028, prohibit a person from keeping more than 25 roosters that are movement constrained. Movement constrained refers to long-term enclosure or a tether. The impetus for specifying that the prohibitions apply only to movement constrained roosters is because roosters raised for cockfighting purposes are usually isolated during their lifetime. Information provided by the Author notes these roosters are kept in inhumane conditions meant to heighten their aggressive behaviors.

This bill provides an exemption for all the following situations:

- A person who keeps or raises roosters for purposes of food production if the person is subject to local, state, or federal inspection laws or regulations.
- A public or private school registered with the State Department of Education.
- A government-operated animal shelter.
- A nonprofit animal welfare organization, as defined.
- A 4-H, Future Farmers of America, or Grange project, if the 4-H, FFA, or Grange has provided written approval for the project to the person keeping or raising the roosters.
- A person who owns and breeds poultry for the purpose of lawful exhibition in accordance with accepted poultry raising practices and all laws and regulations governing exhibition, has not been convicted for any cockfighting offense within the preceding 10 years, and does not possess more than 25 gamefowl roosters.

Although the exemption in this bill is very broad, some opponents who are involved in poultry shows note the limit of 25 gamefowl roosters may be difficult to comply with, as these show birds are often kept in solo confinement for purposes of protecting the animal feathers and plumage. If a person has more than 25 roosters, but they are not confined to a solo long-term enclosure or are not tethered, then the 25 limit does not apply. This bill specifies that local governments may continue with whatever ordinance they choose. This bill does not increase or create any new

penalties or infractions for cockfighting but instead aims to reduce the supply of roosters that are more commonly bred and raised solely for purposes of cockfighting. The penalty provisions of this bill include a civil penalty not to exceed \$2,500 per violation. However, this bill requires that prior to an initial civil action where public safety is not at risk, that a person be afforded a 14-day period to correct the violation or rehome the rooster. If an individual complies within the 14-day time period, as specified, they will likely avoid the penalty.

*Local Ordinances.* There are a number of local ordinances which limit the number of roosters a person may keep, including the counties of Los Angeles, Contra Costa, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Solano, Santa Barbara, and Santa Clara. Each ordinance varies on the number of roosters allowed in each jurisdiction. With the exception of Ventura County, the other counties prohibit less than 25. A few counties authorize the number of roosters based on the property size. Los Angeles and Contra Costa provide certain exemptions to the number limit for activities like Future Farmers of America. Limiting the number of animals that an individual can own is not unprecedented at the local level. For example, within the city limits of Sacramento, individual may only have up to 10 pets and of those 10, only three can be dogs or swine.

- 3. Arguments in Support.** A broad coalition of supporters write in support and note, “AB 928 is legislation to further deter cockfighting in California by addressing gamefowl yards--properties where roosters are bred and raised and then sold for cockfighting. As first responders in California, we see firsthand the harm animal fighting inflicts on our communities. AB 928 is a smart, measured complement to existing law to give law enforcement and humane officers new tool to stop gamefowl trafficking yards from becoming large criminal operations. It will prevent cruelty, protect public safety, and reduce the long-term costs of enforcement.”

The California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association writes in support and notes, “California’s poultry industry contributes billions of dollars annually to the state’s economy and supports thousands of jobs. Reducing the concentration and movement of birds commonly associated with illegal cockfighting operations helps protect the state’s poultry industry and strengthens California’s overall animal health preparedness. This bill provides a practical enforcement mechanism while preserving appropriate exemptions for legitimate agricultural, educational, and research activities. By helping address illegal gamefowl operations, the measure supports both animal welfare and the state’s ongoing efforts to prevent the spread of HPAI and other contagious poultry diseases.”

Humane World and Humane Vet Alliance write in support and note that this legislation “will facilitate more effective enforcement of California’s prohibition on cockfighting by allowing law enforcement to address gamefowl yards before they become large criminal operations; limiting the number of roosters permitted on a parcel to 25 in total; and providing for civil citations and a one-year grace period. The legislation also allows common-sense exemptions for commercial poultry operations, 4H, and FFA projects.”

The County of Monterey writes in support and notes, “Specifically, AB 928 establishes civil penalties for keeping more than twenty-five roosters that are movement constrained on a parcel of property. The bill includes commonsense exemptions for commercial poultry operations, schools, animal agencies, poultry hobbyists, and FFA, 4-H, and State Grange projects. Most significantly, AB 928 does not ban anyone from having roosters for legal purposes.”

The National Alliance of Gang Investigators writes in support and notes, “Cockfighting is organized crime. Illegal animal fighting rings operate as hubs for drug trafficking, money laundering, weapons, and violence. Gang members and cartels frequently participate in or control these events, using them as revenue sources and drug distribution networks. Gamefowl limits prevent individuals from maintaining large-scale inventories of gamecocks while preserving legitimate agricultural and hobby activities. By disrupting the infrastructure that sustains illegal operations, these laws improve investigators' ability to dismantle networks that threaten public safety.”

4. **Arguments in Opposition.** California Human Development, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Center for Employment Training, Central Valley Opportunity Center, Comite De Accion Del Valle, First Day Foundation, -Hermandad Mexicana Nacional, Immigo, LA Cooperativa Campesina De California, Los Amigos De LA Comunidad, INC., Mothers of East Los Angeles, Proteus INC., Social Equity Los Angeles, Wonder Wood Ranch, and Asian Law Alliance write in opposition to this bill “due to its disparate impact on immigrant communities and the increased risk of unwarranted law-enforcement scrutiny that would result from its enforcement. The recent amendments only clarify that the civil penalties have to be paid to counties and do not address our concerns. Our organizations collectively offer healthcare, legal, workforce and educational resources to low-income individuals, including the undocumented.”

The California Association for the Preservation of Gamefowl writes in opposition and notes, “Even with recent revisions, AB 928 persists in restricting rooster ownership statewide by targeting birds categorized as “movement constrained” via tethering or specific enclosures. These modifications, however, fail to address our fundamental objections. The legislation continues to operate on the flawed premise that standard husbandry techniques are illicit behavior, creating a precarious legal environment for law-abiding poultry owners. The updated language simply redirects the regulatory focus without correcting the bill's primary defect: the erroneous assumption that proper gamefowl management equates to criminal intent. Furthermore, the threat of civil fines reaching \$2,500 per animal daily remains, placing a potentially ruinous financial burden upon the shoulders of legitimate preservationists and exhibitors who operate entirely within the law.”

The California Hmong Chamber of Commerce writes in opposition and notes, “While AB 928 is intended to address concerns regarding illegal cockfighting, the bill imposes restrictions that may substantially burden lawful religious and cultural practices without requiring proof that a rooster owner is engaged in unlawful conduct. California already possesses robust criminal statutes prohibiting cockfighting and animal cruelty. Rather than focusing enforcement on individuals

engaged in illegal activity, AB 928 risks imposing penalties on law-abiding families whose ownership of roosters is connected to legitimate religious, cultural, agricultural, or traditional purposes.

“The burden created by AB 928 would fall disproportionately on communities where rooster ownership is culturally and religiously significant. Although the legislation is facially neutral, its practical effect may result in increased inspection, citation, and law enforcement action directed toward immigrant and minority communities where these traditions remain common. Such outcomes raise concerns regarding equal treatment and selective enforcement. This perpetuates an erosion of trust between government institutions and historically underserved populations.”

X-CITYFEED writes in opposition and notes, “While the bill may appear to address a narrow issue, its consequences extend far beyond poultry ownership. For more than a century, residents across California have raised roosters and chickens without issue and without the need for restrictive ordinances. These individuals support a wide network of local businesses, including feed stores, hardware stores, milling companies, and agricultural suppliers. They purchase feed, grain, tools, lumber, water systems, nuts, bolts, and countless other farming supplies—contributing directly to our local economy and tax base.”

5. **Policy Issues for Consideration.** *Should this bill include an extended period to comply with the 25-rooster limit for those individuals who currently are in possession of more than 25 roosters? This bill will take effect on January 1, 2028. However, for those individuals who currently have more than the authorized number of roosters proposed in this bill, it may be difficult to rehome or find a rescue or other organization to take in these birds. The potential for a fine could result in birds being abandoned, euthanized, or discarded by other means. The author should continue to work with all stakeholders to ensure that a compliance timeline is appropriate to balance animal welfare and safety and allow individuals who care for these pets to find a safe and appropriate home.*

*Should this bill require an educational component for local communities prior to the July 1, 2028, implementation date or before any penalties are assessed?*

Opponents have shared concerns that some communities may not be aware of the limits of rooster ownership proposed by this bill and could be potentially targeted for non-compliance. Would this bill benefit from an educational requirement that provides sufficient information or guidance to communities about this bill, including how the 25-limit is applied. *The author should continue to work with stakeholders to provide appropriate outreach to impacted communities.*

*Penalties and Compliance.* This bill establishes civil penalties for a violation of the cap of rooster ownership proposed by this bill, which will further be reviewed and discussed in the Senate Committee on Judiciary. However, should the penalties be tiered or structured so that a first-time violation (with no subsequent) violations is not levied the same as repeat violations. Should this bill specifically provide clarity that local animal control officers have discretion in recommending penalties? *The author should continue to work with stakeholders.*

*Poultry Shows.* This bill proposes an exemption for individuals who participate in poultry shows so long as they own and breed for the purpose of lawful exhibition, have not been convicted of a cockfighting offense, and have no more than 25 gamefowl roosters. Although 25 roosters for an average person may be a lot, for those who are show bird enthusiasts, this limit may unintentionally impact breeders who are not part of any illicit activities related to their birds. Should there be any local discretion to extend the 25-rooster cap if approved by a local jurisdiction? *The Author should continue to work with all stakeholders to ensure that the limit on those who are involved in poultry shows are not unnecessarily restrictive.*

*Enclosures.* This bill reserves the 25-rooster limit for those individuals whose roosters are movement constrained, which includes being kept in a long-term enclosure or being tethered. These individuals who may own birds specifically for show, may keep those birds enclosed to protect feathers or the health of the bird. Could the definition of enclosure be narrowed to more specifically identify the types of enclosures that are routinely found in illegal cockfighting bird breeding compared to what a person would use for show roosters, that are presumably loved and well cared for? *The author should continue to work with stakeholders to ensure the definitions in the bill address the issue.*

## **SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:**

### Support:

Actors and Others for Animals  
 American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals  
 Animal Resource Center of the Inland Empire  
 California Agricultural Commissioners & Sealers Association  
 California Animal Welfare Association  
 Central California SPCA  
 City of Norco Animal Control Shelter  
 County of Monterey  
 County of Sacramento  
 County of Santa Barbara  
 East Bay SPCA  
 Fresno Humane Animal Services  
 Friends of Colusa County Animal Shelter  
 Hawaiian Humane Society  
 Humane Society of Imperial County  
 Humane Veterinary Medical Alliance (HUMANEVMA)  
 Humane World for Animals  
 Inland Valley Humane Society & S.P.C.A.  
 Lompoc  
 National Alliance of Gang Investigators Associations  
 National Animal Care & Control Association  
 Oakland Animal Services  
 Palo Alto Humane Society  
 Pasadena Humane  
 Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA

Pets in Need  
Public Interest Coalition  
Ridgecrest Animal Services  
San Diego Humane Society and SPCA  
San Francisco SPCA  
Santa Barbara County Animal Services  
Santa Barbara Humane  
Santa Cruz County Animal Shelter Foundation  
Sonoma County Animal Services  
Southeast Area Animal Control Authority  
Stray Cat Alliance  
Sutter Animal Services Authority

Opposition:

Asian Law Alliance  
California Association for the Preservation of Gamefowl  
California Hmong Chamber of Commerce  
California Human Development  
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation  
Center for Employment Training  
Central Valley Opportunity Center  
Comite De Accion Del Valle  
First Day Foundation  
Hermandad Mexicana Nacional  
Immigo  
LA Cooperativa Campesina De California  
Los Amigos De LA Comunidad, INC.  
Mothers of East Los Angeles  
Proteus INC.  
Social Equity Los Angeles  
Wonder Wood Ranch  
X-CITYFEED  
Numerous Individuals

**-- END --**