

## Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Commission Thursday, February 18, 2021 – 4:30 to 6:30 pm

**Virtual Meeting (ZOOM)** 

https://us02web.zoom.us/i/84962084828?pwd=U2VLYjJEK1VTUFc3NIMxZ0Q1QzBMQT09

Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Commission

Meeting ID: 849 6208 4828 Passcode: 462984

### APPROVED AGENDA

(Please note the virtual meeting time)

### **Preliminary Matters**

- 1. Roll Call
- 2. Approval of Draft Minutes from 1/21/2021 meeting Attachment 1

The public may comment virtually about any item <u>not</u> on the agenda. <u>Public comments are limited to two minutes per speaker.</u> Public comments regarding agenda items will be heard while the Commission is discussing the item.

### **Action Items**

Public comments regarding agenda items will be heard while the Commission is discussing the item. Public comments are limited to two minutes per speaker.

- 1. Subcommittee Reports:
  - a. Prevention, Strategies and Outcomes
- 2. Presentation: City Data Services Training 4:15-5pm.
- Action 1: Discuss and approve the proposed scoring criteria questions for Berkeley Unified School District application for FY22 and FY23. (Commissioner Rose) – Attachment 2
- 4. **Action 2:** Approve election of the Officers: Chair and Vice-Chair. (Commissioner Scheider)
- 5. **Action 3:** Discuss and approve the following recommendation regarding the City of Berkeley Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Procurement Resolution:

The SSBPPE recommends that the Berkeley City Council follow the example of the City and County of San Francisco and include all City sponsored events in the Procurement Resolution such that all City Contracts and Grants include the following language:

"No person shall sell, provide, or otherwise distribute Sugar-Sweetened Beverages (as defined in the Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Distribution Tax - Chapter 7.72 .030 of the Berkeley Muni Code) as part of its performance of a City Contract or Grant." – **Attachments 3a-c.** 

6. **Action 5:** For the good of the order. (Commissioner Scheider)

### **Information Items**

- 1. Approved Meeting Minutes from 12/10/2020 Attachment 4
- 2. FY2015-FY2021 City of Berkeley SSB Tax Revenues Attachments 5a-c

CONFLICT OF INTEREST INFORMATION: City commissioners, pursuant to Government Code section 1090, are responsible for recusing themselves from all commission discussions and actions in which they may have a conflict of interest. If your affiliation, paid or unpaid, with other agencies has changed since the last meeting of this commission, your ability to participate in commission activities may have changed. Individual guidance is available from the City Attorney's Office (CAO). Commissioners are encouraged to consult with the CAO if they have questions, concerns, or would like clarification about matters related to potential conflicts of interest.

### The CAO may be reached at:

Email: <a href="mailto:attorney@cityofberkeley.info">attorney@cityofberkeley.info</a>
TEL: (510) 981-6950 TDD: (510) 981-6903, FAX: (510) 981-6960
2180 Milvia Street 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704 - Office Hours: Mon-Fri, 8am-5pm

The next ZOOM meeting will be on Thursday, March 18, 2021 at the same time. Please visit the City of Berkeley's Commission webpage <a href="http://www.cityofberkeley.info/commissions">http://www.cityofberkeley.info/commissions</a> for meeting details and updates.

AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT DISCLAIMER: This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6418 (V) or 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

### **SB 343 DISCLAIMER:**

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the Public Health Division located on 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704.

#### COMMUNICATION DISCLAIMER:

Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record. If you do not want your

Approved Meeting Agenda – SSBPPE Commission 2/18/2021 Page 3 of 3

e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the commission secretary for further information.



## **Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Commission**

Thursday, January 21, 2021. 4:30 - 6:30 PM

**Zoom Meeting** 

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81091200344?pwd=S1h3Z001ZUw3SXJxNG9ibEdhcVFvQT09

Meeting ID: 810 9120 0344 Passcode: 331747

### **DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

The meeting convened at 4:37 pm.

**ROLL CALL** 

Commissioners Browne (5:10pm), Crawford (4:50pm),

**Present:** Gallegos-Castillo, Moore (5:15pm), Morales, Namkung,

Rose, and Scheider

**Absent:** None. **Excused:** None

**Staff present:** Kelly Wallace, Janice Chin, and Dechen Tsering

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Jezra Thompson, Berkeley Unified School District Dr. Vicki Alexander, Healthy Black Families

### **ACTION ON MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes - Moved to approve the draft minutes of the meeting on 12/10/2020.

M/S/C: Commissioners Morales/Scheider

Ayes: Commissioners Gallegos-Castillo, Morales, Namkung, Rose,

and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioners Browne, Crawford, Moore

Recused: None Excused: None

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Approved to adopt the proposed schedule of SSBPPE meeting dates in 2021 with proposed edits: move July meeting to March 20, 2021 at 10am.

M/S/C: Commissioners Scheider/Gallegos-Castillo

Ayes: Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Morales,

Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

**Absent from vote:** Commissioner Browne and Moore

Recused: None Excused: None

2. Approve to nullify the previous (#1) approval of SSBPPE meeting dates and adopt the revised 2021 meeting dates as follows:

Month	Meeting Day and Date	Time
January 2021	Thursday 1/21/2021	4:30 pm
February 2021	Thursday 2/18/2021	4:30 pm
March 2021	Thursday 3/18/2021	4:30 pm
	Saturday 3/20/2021	10:00am
April 2021	Thursday 4/1/2021	4:30 pm
May 2021	Thursday 5/20/2021	4:30 pm
June 2021	Thursday 6/17/2021	4:30 pm

Month	Meeting Day and Date	Time
July 2021	Moved to 3/20/2021	
August 2021	No Meeting	
September 2021	Thursday 9/16/2021	6:30 pm
October 2021	Thursday 10/21/2021	6:30 pm
November 2021	Thursday 11/18/2021	6:30 pm
December 2021	No Meeting	

M/S/C: Commissioners Scheider/Namkung

**Ayes:** Commissioners Browne, Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None Absent from vote: None Recused: None Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Commission Draft Meeting Minutes January 21, 2021 Page 3 of 3

Excused: None

3. Approve the proposed SSBPPE FY21 Work Plan with edits including deleting #2 and #3 in the Policy Subcommittee's draft work plan.

M/S/C: Commissioners Scheider/Namkung

**Ayes:** Commissioners Browne, Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent from vote: None
Recused: None
Excused: None

This meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

### NEXT ONLINE (ZOOM) SPECIAL MEETING:

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday**, **February 18**, **2021**. Please check the SSBPPE Commission page on the City of Berkeley Commission webpage for updated information.

Respectfully Submitted, Dechen Tsering, Commission Secretary Minutes will be approved at the February 18, 2021 meeting.

## Selection Criteria and Screening Questions for Berkeley Unified School District for RFP FY22 and FY23

REVIEWER:	
APPLICANT: RUSD	

		Lowest Score Level				Highest Score Level	Max. Score per Criteria
1	Does the proposal propose to decrease access to sugary drinks and/or improve access to drinking water (15%)	0.00	5.00	10.00	15.00	20.00	20.00
1.1	Does the proposed intervention decrease access to sugary drinks?	No	Minimal	Some	Yes but not explicitly	Explicitly	
1.2	Does the proposed intervention improve access to drinking water?	No	Minimal	Some	Yes but not explicitly	Explicitly	
1.3	Does the proposal include a policy to improve the beverage environment to reduce access to SSBs or increase access to water?	None	mentions role of policy but no policy stated	mentions policy though not clear	clear policy not yet adopted	already adopted a clear policy	
2	Does the proposal increase or strengthen SSB policies in school and outside of school? (20%)	0.00	5.00	10.00	15.00	20.00	20
2.1	Does the proposal include policy change?	No	Minimal	Some	Yes but not explicitly	Explicitly	
2.2	Does the proposal help strengthen SSB policies in/outside schools?	No	Minimal	Some	Yes but not explicitly	Explicitly	
2.2	Does the proposal articulate clear strategies to improve the beverage environment inside and/or outside schools?	No	mentions importance of strategy but none articulated	mentions strategies though not clear what they are or how they improve the beverage env.	clear strategies articulated to improve the beverage env.	very clearly described strategies with demonstrate d success in the past	
3	Does the proposal support the annual administration of the Berkeley adopted Youth Risk Behaviour Survey to evaluate students' SSB knowledge, consumption, access and policy perceptions? (20%)	0	5	10	15	20	20
3.1	Are the proposed activities informed by evidence-based research (EBR)?	No/Can't tell	Mentions EBR but doesn't link to the proposed program.	Mentions evidence with some link to program	and	Very clearly articulated and informed by EBR with example	
3.2	Does the proposal address changes in knowledge, consumption, access and/or perceptions among BUSD students?	No	Minimal	Some	Yes but not explicitly	Explicitly	

COMMISSIONER:

3.3   Does the proposal utilized the Youth Risk Behaviour Survey?   No   Minimal   Some   Yes but not explicitly			Lowest Score Level				Highest Score Level	Max. Score per Criteria
Strong	3.3		No	Minimal	Some		Explicitly	
program defined clearly?    A.2   What percentage of the target population is in a priority group mentioned in the RFP?   Sow   Sow   Sow   Sow   Sow   Working   exclusively with priority group mentioned in the RFP?   Some   Some   Some   Some   Some   Yes		grade levels and priority populations are	0.00	4.00	8.00	11.00	15.00	15
4.2   What percentage of the target population is in a priority group mentioned in the RFP?   Solution   Sol	4.1		No mention	but not		Strong	articulation of	
4.3   Does the proposal explain how students at different grade levels are included?   No evidence   Minimal appropriate?   No evidence   Some   Some   Some   Some   Some   Strong   Evidence   Some   Evidence   Some   Evidence	4.2				50%	>50% <100%	Working exclusively with priority	
appropriate?  4 Proposal documents policy elements that will last beyond the grant period. (15%)  4.1 Does the proposal include policy outcomes that last beyond the grant period?  4.2 Do the proposed activities transfer knowledge and build habits that will be ongoing?  4.3 Does the proposal build on facility and/or equipment infrastructure that will last beyond the contract period?  4.5 Will the partnerships continue after the funding period?  5 Proposal budget matches the work plan and is appropriate. (10%)  6 Vague/minim al some/Fair all possibly definitely definitely definitely definitely somewhat clear very clear poorly somewhat clear very clear budget and work plan clear?  6 Vague/minim all possibly definitely definitely definitely definitely somewhat clear very clear poorly somewhat clear very clear budget and work plan clear? Not clear poorly somewhat clear very clear budget and	4.3		No		Some			
Will last beyond the grant period. (15%)	4.4		No evidence	Minimal				
that last beyond the grant period?  of partnership/collaboration n  4.2 Do the proposed activities transfer knowledge and build habits that will be ongoing?  4.3 Does the proposal build on facility and/or equipment infrastructure that will last beyond the contract period?  4.5 Will the partnerships continue after the funding period?  Froposal budget matches the work plan and is appropriate. (10%)  5.1 Are the budget and work plan clear?  Does the proposal ask for too much money  None Vague/minim Some/Fair Good Excellent  None Vague/minim Some/Fair all partnership.  Outlier possibly definitely  definitely  definitely  1.000	4		0.00	4.00	8.00	11.00	15.00	15.00
4.2       Do the proposed activities transfer knowledge and build habits that will be ongoing?       None       Vague/minim al       Some/Fair Good       Excellent         4.3       Does the proposal build on facility and/or equipment infrastructure that will last beyond the contract period?       no       unclear       possibly       definitely         4.5       Will the partnerships continue after the funding period?       no       possibly       definitely         5       Proposal budget matches the work plan and is appropriate. (10%)       0.00       4.00       6.00       8.00       10.00         5.1       Are the budget and work plan clear?       not clear       poorly       somewhat       clear       Very clear         5.2       Does the proposal ask for too much money       Way too       budget       reasonable       budget and	4.1		of partnership/		clear	Good	plans for collaboration and	
4.3 Does the proposal build on facility and/or equipment infrastructure that will last beyond the contract period?  4.5 Will the partnerships continue after the funding period?  5 Proposal budget matches the work plan and is appropriate. (10%)  5.1 Are the budget and work plan clear?  5.2 Does the proposal ask for too much money  no unclear possibly definitely  no possibly  4.00 6.00 8.00 10.00  4.00 6.00 Very clear poorly somewhat clear very clear budget and work plan clear?	4.2	knowledge and build habits that will be	None		Some/Fair	Good		
4.5 Will the partnerships continue after the funding period?  5 Proposal budget matches the work plan and is appropriate. (10%)  5.1 Are the budget and work plan clear?  6.00 not clear poorly somewhat clear Very clear  5.2 Does the proposal ask for too much money Way too budget reasonable budget and	4.3	Does the proposal build on facility and/or equipment infrastructure that will last	no	unclear	possibly		definitely	
and is appropriate. (10%)  5.1 Are the budget and work plan clear? not clear poorly somewhat clear Very clear  5.2 Does the proposal ask for too much money Way too budget reasonable budget and	4.5	Will the partnerships continue after the	no		possibly		definitely	
5.2 Does the proposal ask for too much money Way too budget reasonable budget and			0.00	4.00	6.00	8.00	10.00	10
	5.1	Are the budget and work plan clear?	not clear	poorly	somewhat	clear	Very clear	
match match			_	doesn't	reasonable		workplan	100.00

100.00



ACTION CALENDAR November 19, 2019

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts (SSBPPE)

Submitted by: Poki Namkung, Chairperson, SSBPPE Commission

Subject: Recommendation that the City Council pass a resolution regarding

procurement, sales and serving of sugar-sweetened beverages.

### RECOMMENDATION

The Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts recommends that the Berkeley City Council adopt a Resolution that City of Berkeley departments and City food services contractors shall not:

- serve sugar-sweetened beverages at City meetings and events on City property;
- 2) procure sugar-sweetened beverages with City funds; or,
- 3) sell sugar-sweetened beverages on City property, including in vending machines.

### FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

Cost of promulgating information, notifying City Departments and revising clauses in City contracts.

### **CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS**

Currently, the City of Berkeley has no policy regarding either the procurement of sugarsweetened beverages with City funds or the sales or distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages at City meetings and events or on City property.

Definitions: Sugar-sweetened beverages or SSBs refer to all beverages with added caloric sweeteners with a minimum of 2 calories per fluid ounce, as defined in Chapter 7.72 of the City of Berkeley Municipal Code. SSBs include juices with added sweetener, sodas, energy drinks, sweetened teas and coffee drinks, and sport drinks. These drinks offer little or no nutritional value, but include massive quantities of added sugar. For instance, a single 20-ounce bottle of soda typically contains the equivalent of approximately 16 teaspoons of sugar.

In BMC Chapter 7.72, SSBs exclude 100% juice, diet drinks, waters, and milk drinks as well as medical drinks and baby formula.

### **BACKGROUND**

In November of 2014, the Berkeley voters passed Measure D with 76% of the vote, which requires both the collection of a 1 cent-per-ounce tax on the distribution of SSBs in the City of Berkeley and the convening of the Sugar Sweetened Beverage Products Panel of Experts (SSBPPE) to recommend investments to both reduce the consumption of SSBs as well as to address the health consequences of the consumption of SSBs including diabetes, dental caries, heart disease and obesity.<sup>ii</sup>

To accomplish these goals, the SSBPPE recommended that the City create the Healthy Berkeley program to reduce the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages ("SSB") in Berkeley and to address the effects of SSB consumption. The City Council unanimously adopted this recommendation on November 29, 2016 and awarded a \$1.5 million per year investment to be granted to community agencies and the Berkeley Unified School District garden and nutrition program. \$225,000, or 15%, of this funding is allocated to the City Public Health Division to administer and evaluate the Healthy Berkeley Program. See November 29, 2016, Council agenda items 33a and 33b.<sup>iii</sup>

The City of Berkeley requires that all Healthy Berkeley funded programs (including the school district) adopt an organizational policy curtailing the service, procurement and sale of SSBs. The purpose of these organizational policies is to change norms in our community about consuming sugary drinks and support the educational work of these programs.

We know from the public health campaigns to reduce tobacco use, that institutional policies that change norms have a powerful impact on behavior and are a vital tool to improving health in our communities. Education and media campaigns are not enough to change behaviors, especially when pervasive and persuasive marketing by corporations influence choices that people make, and when there is an addictive aspect to the behavior as is the case with both tobacco and sugar.<sup>iv</sup>

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**

None

### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

In 2014, Berkeley voters overwhelmingly passed Measure D and since then the City of Berkeley has led the effort to reduce the consumption of sugary drinks and resulting health impacts and disparities, not only in Berkeley but also in the Bay Area and nationwide. Sales of sugary beverages have decreased and school and community groups have been funded to continue the effort to reduce sugary drink consumption and improve health. Now is an opportune time for the City to once again provide leadership for City employees and the community by enacting a healthy beverage policy for the City that restricts procurement of sugary drinks as well as the serving and sales of sugary drinks at City events. This policy would be responsive to the will of the voters, supportive of school and community efforts to improve Berkeley residents' health, and a

model to other cities. This policy will align the City with Healthy Berkeley grantees who have already adopted similar policies. The SSBPPE encourages the City to take this step to set an example and demonstrate its own commitment to the further reducing sugary drink consumption and improvement in community health.

### **ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED**

In January 2018, the SSSBPPE voted to recommend that the Berkeley City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to direct the City of Berkeley departments and City food services contractors to refrain from: 1) Procuring sugar-sweetened beverages with City funds; 2) Selling sugar-sweetened beverages on City property, including in vending machines; and, 3) Serving sugar-sweetened beverages at City meetings and events on City property. On March 27, 2018, the City Council voted to refer the recommendation to the City Manager and request that the City Manager draft an ordinance for consideration by the City Council. In June 2018, the City Council ranked this ordinance around 32 among items to develop for the City. No further action was taken until May of 2019, when Council Member Harrison reached out to Holly Scheider, her appointee on the SSBPPE, and suggested that the Commission put forward a Resolution in place of an Ordinance with the same content.

### **CITY MANAGER**

The City Manager [TYPE ONE] concurs with / takes no position on the content and recommendations of the Commission's Report. [OR] Refer to the budget process.

Note: If the City Manager does not (a) concur, (b) takes any other position, or (c) refer to the budget process, a council action report must be prepared. Indicate under the <u>CITY MANAGER</u> heading, "See companion report."

### **CONTACT PERSON**

**Dechen Tsering** 

### Attachment:

1: Resolution

Exhibit A: RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING CITY POLICY / AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO DIRECT CITY OF BERKELEY DEPARTMENTS AND CONTRACTORS TO REFRAIN FROM PROCURING, SERVING OR SELLING SUGARY DRINKS

### RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING CITY POLICY / AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO DIRECT CITY OF BERKELEY DEPARTMENTS AND CONTRACTORS TO REFRAIN FROM PROCURING, SERVING OR SELLING SUGARY DRINKS

WHEREAS, the City of Berkeley is known for its commitment to reducing inequities in diet and disease and in promoting access to healthy food and beverages.

WHEREAS, drinking just *one* serving of sugar-sweetened beverage per day poses a **30 percent or higher risk** of becoming diabetic.

WHEREAS, drinking just **one** serving of sugar-sweetened beverage per day poses a **30 percent or higher risk** of early death from cardiovascular disease.

WHEREAS, city employees deserve a healthy work environment, with an increased variety of healthier low-sugar alternative beverages such as flavored waters, plain or carbonated water, 100% juice, milk drinks, diet drinks, unsweetened or artificially sweetened iced teas and coffee drinks.

WHEREAS, it is recognized that city staff are free to bring and consume their own sugary beverages at work.

WHEREAS, other public institutions that have completely eliminated the sales of sugar sweetened beverages on their premises and have demonstrated that as a result, positive changes have been documented in the staff's metabolic disease indicators associated with lower risk of diabetes and heart disease

WHEREAS, giving City employees access to healthier beverages in the workplace will increase healthy beverage consumption and reduce the impact of diet-related disease, thus reducing the City's health care expenses.

WHEREAS, the City of Berkeley requires that *all* organizations receiving funding from Healthy Berkeley not serve or sell sugar sweetened beverages on their premises.

WHEREAS, the Berkeley Unified School District does not serve or sell soda to students of all ages and students on their premises and this contributes to positive adult role modeling regarding healthy beverage consumption.

WHEREAS, Chapter 7.72 of the City of Berkeley Municipal Code<sup>v</sup> has already defined sugar-sweetened beverages as all beverages with added caloric sweeteners with a minimum of 2 calories per fluid ounce, including juices with added sweetener, sodas, energy drinks, sweetened teas and coffee drinks, and sport drinks which offer little or no nutritional value, but include massive quantities of added sugar and in addition,

Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 7.72 also defines exemptions and thus excludes waters, 100% juice, milk drinks, diet drinks, as well as medical drinks and baby formula.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Berkeley and City food services contractors **shall not**:

- 1) serve sugar-sweetened beverages at City meetings and events on City property,
- 2) procure sugar-sweetened beverages with City funds; and,
- 3) sell sugar-sweetened beverages on City property, including in vending machines.

<sup>i</sup> B.M.C. 7388-NS § 7.72, 2014, City of Berkeley

"BUSD will not sell or serve sugar-sweetened beverages (as defined by the SSB tax) at any BUSD schools or campuses."

"Funded organizations must have in place or agree to adopt prior to being funded an organizational policy prohibiting serving SSBs at organization sponsored events or meetings."

iv https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/01/the-sugar-addiction-taboo/282699/vB.M.C. 7388-NS § 7.72, 2014, City of Berkeley

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>ii</sup> B.M.C. 7388-NS § 7.72, 2014, City of Berkeley

https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City\_Council/2016/11\_Nov/City\_Council\_\_11-29-2016\_-\_Regular\_Meeting\_Agenda.aspx\_Language in the Nov. 29, 2016 Resolution, Agenda item 33a, pages 9 and 11, follows:



## BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL HEALTH, LIFE ENRICHMENT, EQUITY & COMMUNITY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

### Monday, February 24, 2020 10:00 AM

2180 Milvia Street, 6th Floor - Redwood Room

Committee Members:

Councilmembers Rashi Kesarwani, Ben Bartlett, and Sophie Hahn Alternate: Councilmember Rigel Robinson

Roll Call: 10:06 a.m. Councilmember Kesarwani absent.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters – 2 speakers

### **Minutes for Approval**

Draft minutes for the Committee's consideration and approval.

### 1. Minutes - February 10, 2020

**Action:** M/S/C (Bartlett/Hahn) to approve the minutes of January 10, 2020.

**Vote:** Ayes – Bartlett, Hahn; Noes – None; Abstain – None; Absent – Kesarwani.

Councilmember Kesarwani present at 10:08 a.m.

### **Committee Action Items**

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up. The Chair will determine the number of persons interested in speaking on each item. Up to ten (10) speakers may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Chair may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes.

Following review and discussion of the items listed below, the Committee may continue an item to a future committee meeting, or refer the item to the City Council.

### **Committee Action Items**

2. Listening Session on Homelessness (15 minutes) – 2 speakers

3. Healthy Checkout Ordinance (Item contains revised materials)

From: Councilmembers Harrison and Hahn

Referred: October 28, 2019

Due: April 26, 2020

**Recommendation:** 1. Adopt an ordinance requiring stores over 2,500 square feet in size to sell more nutritious food and beverage options in their checkout areas.

2. Refer to the City Manager to determine funding and staffing needs to implement

and enforce the ordinance and sources of funding to support this program.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Kate Harrison, Councilmember, District 4, (510) 981-7140

Item continued to next meeting on March 9, 2020.

4a. Recommendation that the City Council Pass a Resolution Regarding Procurement, Sales and Serving of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages.

From: Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts

Referred: January 21, 2020

Due: June 9, 2020

Recommendation: The Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts recommends that the Berkeley City Council adopt a Resolution that City of Berkeley departments and City food services contractors shall not: 1. Serve sugar-sweetened beverages at City meetings and events on City property; 2. Procure sugar-sweetened beverages with City funds; or, 3. Sell sugar-sweetened beverages on City property, including in vending machines.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Dechen Tsering, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-5300

4b. Companion Report: Recommendation that the City Council Pass a Resolution Regarding Procurement, Sales, and Serving Sugar-Sweetened Beverages

From: City Manager

Referred: January 21, 2020

Due: June 9, 2020

**Recommendation:** Recommend that the City Council adopt an amended resolution that recognizes the important principles in the Commission recommendation, clarifies the intent of the measure and provides some flexibility for City programs and staff while still emphasizing availability of healthy options. This amended resolution would require that the majority of all beverages provided or sold at any City event or on any City property (including vending machines) be non-sugar sweetened beverages (as defined in chapter 7.72 of the Berkeley Municipal Code) and education materials be provided to all COB staff to actively discourage the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages and encourage the consumption of water.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Kelly Wallace, Housing and Community Services, (510) 981-5400

### **Committee Action Items**

**Action:** 3 speakers. Discussion held. M/S/C (Hahn/Bartlett) to move an item to Council recommending approval of the Sugar Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Resolution regarding procurement, sales and serving of sugar-sweetened beverages with the following changes in the resolved clause:

Therefore be it resolved that the City of Berkeley shall not:

- 1. Procure sugar-sweetened beverages with City funds; and
- 2. Serve or sell sugar-sweetened beverages on City property, including in vending machines.

And be it further resolved that the City discourages sugar-sweetened beverages at events on City property that receive City of Berkeley funding, and mandate that these events be required to provide options other than sugar-sweetened beverages.

And be it further resolved that in areas or facilities where employees regularly work beyond the core business hours of 8 a.m. – 6 p.m., the City of Berkeley shall provide refrigerators in good working order and of adequate size for the number of employees in that area, to bring and store their own beverages.

In addition, ask the City Council to make a referral to the Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts to consider how to regulate sugar sweetened beverages at events held on City of Berkeley Property hosted by non-City entities who receive City of Berkeley funds.

Vote: All Ayes.

### **Unscheduled Items**

These items are not scheduled for discussion or action at this meeting. The Committee may schedule these items to the Action Calendar of a future Committee meeting.

### 5a. Recommendation to Modify Policies Related to the Enforcement of the Berkeley Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Ordinance

From: Housing Advisory Commission

Referred: October 29, 2019

Due: April 27, 2020

**Recommendation:** Approve modifications to policies related to the enforcement of the Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Ordinance, as follows:

- 1. Increase staffing to implement enforcement of the ordinance as part of the next budget;
- 2. Improve signage related to the ordinance in residential buildings;
- 3. Make the complaint process less onerous and more user-friendly, including enabling complainants to submit complaints electronically, providing complaint forms in different languages, and removing language requiring the statements to be "sworn," and considering other, less threatening language that still expects a complaint be provided under the best of appellant's knowledge;
- 4. Relax the current requirements around how the Ordinance-based complaint form must be completed in order to be processed (e.g., removing the requirement of providing two separate complaints from different individuals within a six-month period, if the building contains two or fewer units, removing the requirement of providing a sworn statement under penalty of perjury); and
- 5. Refer to the Community Health and Cannabis Commissions the question of whether the use of recreational (non-medical) cannabis should be incorporated into the Smoke-Free Housing Ordinance.

Financial Implications: See report

Contact: Mike Uberti, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-7400

### 5b. Companion Report: Recommendation to Modify Policies Related to the Enforcement of the Berkeley Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Ordinance

From: City Manager

Referred: October 29, 2019

Due: April 27, 2020

**Recommendation:** The City Manager appreciates the Housing Advisory Commission's efforts to strengthen the implementation of the Smoke-free Multi-Unit Housing ordinance and recommends that the proposed modifications be referred to the City Manager Office for an analysis of the financial and legal feasibility of the proposed changes.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: Kelly Wallace, Housing and Community Services, (510) 981-5400

### **Items for Future Agendas**

- Discussion of items to be added to future agendas
  - Add a presentation item to the March 23, 2020, agenda regarding the public health implications for the unsanitary conditions in Aquatic Park.
- Discussion of future hearings and open forums

### **Adjournment**

Adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct record of the Health, Life Enrichment, Equity & Community Committee meeting held on February 24, 2020.

April Richardson, Assistant City Clerk

### **Communications**

Communications submitted to City Council Policy Committees are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA.

### SUBSTITUTE 5/19/2015 ORDINANCE NO. 99-15

FILE NO. 150243

IAdministrative Code - Barring City Departments from Purchasing and City Contractors or 1 Grantees from Selling or Distributing Sugar-Sweetened Beverages 2 Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to bar City departments from using City 3 funds to purchase sugar-sweetened beverages and to bar the sale or distribution of 4 sugar-sweetened beverages under City contracts and grants. 5 6 7 NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font. **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*. 8 **Deletions to Codes** are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font. Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font. 9 Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font. Asterisks (\* \* \* \*) indicate the omission of unchanged Code 10 subsections or parts of tables. 11 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: 12 13 Section 1. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Chapter 101, 14 Sections 101.1 through 101.7, to read as follows: 15 16 CHAPTER 101. RESTRICTING THE PURCHASE, SALE, OR DISTRIBUTION OF SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGES BY OR FOR THE CITY. 17 18 Section 101.1. Title.19 Section 101.2. Definitions. 20 Section 101.3. Barring City Departments From Using City Funds To Purchase Sugar-Sweetened Beverages. 21 Section 101.4. Barring the Sale, Provision, or Distribution of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages 22 23 *Under a City Contract or Grant.* 24 Section 101.5. Waivers and Exclusions. 25 Section 101.6. Enforcement and Penalties.

### (d) Medical Food.

(e) Any product designed as supplemental, meal replacement, or sole-source nutrition that includes proteins, carbohydrates, and multiple vitamins and minerals.

"Contract" means any agreement between the City and a person to provide or procure labor, materials, equipment, supplies, or services to, for, or on behalf of the City for a price to be paid out of monies deposited in the City Treasury or out of trust monies under the control of or collected by the City, but excluding agreements for a cumulative amount of \$5,000 or less per vendor in each fiscal year.

"Grant" means any agreement between the City and a nonprofit entity to provide services to the public or a portion of the public, whether the agreement is funded by the City or by Federal or State grant funds.

"Medical Food" means medical food as defined in Section 109971 of the California Health and Safety Code, including amendments to that Section.

"Milk" means natural liquid milk, natural milk concentrate, or dehydrated natural milk

(whether or not reconstituted), regardless of animal source or butterfat content. For purposes of this

definition, "Milk" includes flavored milk containing no more than 40 grams of total sugar

(naturally-occurring and from added Caloric Sweetener) per 12 ounces.

"Natural Fruit Juice" means the original liquid resulting from the pressing of fruit, the liquid resulting from the complete reconstitution of natural fruit juice concentrate, or the liquid resulting from the complete restoration of water to dehydrated natural fruit juice.

"Natural Vegetable Juice" means the original liquid resulting from the pressing of vegetables, the liquid resulting from the complete reconstitution of natural vegetable juice concentrate, or the liquid resulting from the complete restoration of water to dehydrated natural vegetable juice.

"Nonalcoholic Beverage" means any beverage that is not subject to tax under Part 14

(commencing with Section 32001) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

<u>"Person" means any natural person, corporation, sole proprietorship, partnership, association, joint venture, limited liability company, or other legal entity.</u>

"Powder" means a solid or liquid mixture of ingredients with added Caloric Sweetener used in making, mixing, or compounding Sugar-Sweetened Beverages by mixing the Powder with any one or more other ingredients, including, without limitation, water, ice, Syrup, Simple Syrup, fruits, vegetables, fruit juice, vegetable juice, or carbonation or other gas.

"Simple Syrup" means a mixture of sugar and water.

"Sugar-Sweetened Beverage" means any Nonalcoholic Beverage sold for human consumption that has one or more added Caloric Sweeteners and contains more than 25 calories per 12 ounces of beverage. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, "Sugar-Sweetened Beverage" does not include any of the following:

- <u>(a) Milk.</u>
- (b) Milk alternatives, including but not limited to non-dairy creamers or beverages

  primarily consisting of plant-based ingredients (such as soy, rice, or almond milk products), regardless

  of sugar content.
- (c) Any beverage that contains solely 100 percent Natural Fruit Juice, Natural Vegetable Juice, or combined Natural Fruit Juice and Natural Vegetable Juice.
- (d) Any product sold for consumption by infants, which is commonly referred to as "infant formula," or any product whose purpose is infant rehydration.
  - (e) Medical Food.
- (f) Any product designed as supplemental, meal replacement, or sole-source nutrition that includes proteins, carbohydrates, and multiple vitamins and minerals.
- (g) Any product sold in liquid form designed for use as an oral nutritional therapy for persons who may have a limited ability to absorb or metabolize dietary nutrients from traditional food or beverages.

(h) Any product sold in liquid form designed for use for weight reduction.

"Syrup" means the liquid mixture of ingredients used in making, mixing, or compounding Sugar-Sweetened Beverages using one or more ingredients, including, without limitation, water, ice, a Base Product, Powder, Simple Syrup, fruits, vegetables, fruit juice, vegetable juice, or carbonation or other gas.

## SEC. 101.3. BARRING CITY DEPARTMENTS FROM USING CITY FUNDS TO PURCHASE SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGES.

No City officer, department, or agency (collectively, "department") shall use City funds to purchase Sugar-Sweetened Beverages in any form, except as specifically exempted from or allowed under this Chapter 101.

### SEC. 101.4. BARRING THE SALE, PROVISION, OR DISTRIBUTION OF SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGES UNDER A CITY CONTRACT OR GRANT.

No person shall sell, provide, or otherwise distribute Sugar-Sweetened Beverages, in any form, as part of its performance of a City Contract or Grant.

### SEC. 101.5. WAIVERS AND EXCLUSIONS.

(a) A City officer, department, or agency (collectively, "department"), with the approval of the Purchaser, may waive the requirements of Sections 101.3 and 101.4 in full or in part if the department determines that strict application of the requirement would not be feasible, would create an undue hardship or practical difficulty, or that similar circumstances otherwise warrant granting of the waiver. The department's decision to grant a waiver shall be in writing.

(b) The provisions of Sections 101.3, 101.4, or both, shall not apply where the department makes a written finding that the application or inclusion of such provisions would violate or be

inconsistent with the terms or conditions of a grant, subvention or contract with an agency of the State of California or the United States or the instructions of an authorized representative of any such agency with respect to any such grant, subvention or contract.

- (c) The provisions of Sections 101.3 shall not apply to the purchase by the Department of Public Health of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages for its patients, to be used in cases where a medical professional has determined that providing such beverages is part of the appropriate course of treatment for the patient. The provisions of Sections 101.4 shall not apply to the sale, provision, or other distribution of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages to patients as part of the performance of a Contract with or a Grant from the Department of Public Health in cases where a medical professional has determined that supplying such beverages is part of the appropriate course of treatment for the patient.
- (d) Nothing in this Chapter 101 shall be construed to impair a contract, lease, management agreement or other agreement to which the City is a party on the effective date of this Chapter.
- (e) Departments shall annually report all waivers granted under subsection (a) and determinations of non-applicability made under subsections (b) and (c) to the City Administrator, and include the reason for each waiver.

#### SEC. 101.6. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.

- (a) Any person that sells, provides, or otherwise distributes Sugar-Sweetened Beverages in violation of Section 101.4 may be subject to administrative fines imposed by the City Administrator in the amount of:
  - (1) Up to \$500 for the first violation;
  - (2) Up to \$750 for a second violation within a twelve-month period; and,
  - (3) Up to \$1,000 for a third and subsequent violations within a twelve-month period.
- (b) Except as provided in subsection (a), setting forth the amount of administrative fines,

  Administrative Code Chapter 100, "Procedures Governing the Imposition of Administrative Fines," as

may be amended from time to time, is hereby incorporated in its entirety and shall govern the imposition, enforcement, collection, and review of administrative citations issued by the Director to enforce this Chapter 101 or any administrative regulation adopted under this Chapter.

(c) Any person that sells, provides, or otherwise distributes Sugar-Sweetened Beverages in violation of Section 101.4 shall be deemed to have committed a material breach of the Contract or Grant and, after a noticed hearing, the person or entity may be barred for two years from receiving any City contract, grant agreement, or loan agreement.

### SEC. 101.7. ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS.

The City Administrator, or at the City Administrator's discretion, the Purchaser, may adopt rules, regulations, or guidelines for the implementation of this Chapter 101.

Section 2. Effective and Operative Dates. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance. The operative date of this ordinance shall be September 1, 2015.

APPROVED AS TO FORM: DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By:

THOMAS J. OWEN Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2015\1500454\01015759.docx



### City and County of San Francisco **Tails**

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

### **Ordinance**

File Number:

150243

Date Passed: June 16, 2015

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to bar City departments from using City funds to purchase sugar-sweetened beverages and to bar the sale or distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages under City contracts and grants.

June 01, 2015 Land Use and Transportation Committee ~ RECOMMENDED

June 09, 2015 Board of Supervisors - PASSED, ON FIRST READING

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Christensen, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

June 16, 2015 Board of Supervisors - FINALLY PASSED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Christensen, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

File No. 150243

I hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was FINALLY PASSED on 6/16/2015 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

> Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board



## **Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Product Panel of Experts Commission**

Thursday, December 10, 2020. 4:30 - 6:30 PM

**Zoom Meeting** 

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81091200344?pwd=S1h3Z001ZUw3SXJxNG9ibEdhcVFvQT09

Meeting ID: 810 9120 0344 Passcode: 331747

### APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

The meeting convened at 4:37 pm.

**ROLL CALL** 

Present: Commissioners Crawford (4:50pm), Gallegos-Castillo,

Moore, Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

**Absent:** Commissioner Browne.

Excused: None

Staff present: Dechen Tsering

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC** None

### **ACTION ON MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes - Moved to approve the draft minutes of the meeting on 11/19/2020.

M/S/C: Commissioners Rose/Gallegos-Castillo

Ayes: Commissioners Gallegos-Castillo, Moore, Morales,

Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioners Browne and Crawford

Recused: None Excused: None

### <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>

1. Approved the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) presented by the Prevention, Strategies and Outcomes subcommittee.

M/S/C: Commissioners Namkung/Gallegos-Castillo

Ayes: Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Morales,

Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None

**Abstain:** Commissioner Moore **Absent from vote:** Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

2. Approve to extend the meeting till 6:45pm.

M/S/C: Commissioners Rose/Scheider

Ayes: Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

3. Approve the RFP scoring tool with proposed language and with the public health staff finalizing the format and point tabulation system.

M/S/C: Commissioners Rose/Moore

**Ayes:** Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

4. Absent the previous motion approving the Request for Proposal (RFP) and move to approve the amended RFP with added edits agreed to during the discussion about the scoring tool.

M/S/C: Commissioners Namkung/Scheider

**Ayes:** Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

### 5. Approve to extend the meeting till 7pm.

M/S/C: Commissioners Scheider/Rose

**Ayes:** Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

### 6. Approve to share the scoring tool along with the RFP for the public.

M/S/C: Commissioners Moore/Crawford

**Ayes:** Commissioners Crawford, Gallegos-Castillo, Moore,

Morales, Namkung, Rose, and Scheider

Noes: None Abstain: None

Absent from vote: Commissioner Browne

Recused: None Excused: None

This meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

### **NEXT ONLINE (ZOOM) SPECIAL MEETING:**

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday**, **January 21**, **2021**. Please check the SSBPPE Commission page on the City of Berkeley Commission webpage for updated information.

Respectfully Submitted, Dechen Tsering, Commission Secretary Minutes were approved at the January 21, 2021 meeting.



# City of Berkeley Soda Tax Revenue; Actual vs. Estimated Revenue For the Months of FY 2015 - FY 2021 Presentation to SSBPPE Commission on 1.21.2021

	4	Actual Revenue	E	st. Revenue	Variance	<b>Total Variance</b>
FY 2015	\$	242,986.39				
FY 2016	\$	1,757,271.70				
FY 2017	\$	1,578,389.00				
FY 2018	\$	1,517,949.28	\$	1,500,000.00		
FY 2019	\$	1,606,177.23	\$	1,500,000.00		
FY2020 (Gross)	\$	1,378,196.46	\$	1,500,000.00		
FY2020 (Net)*	\$	1,308,632.53	\$	1,500,000.00	\$ (191,367.47)	
Budgeted						\$ (781,989.35)
FY2021 (Est. Gross)	\$	970,794.00	\$	1,500,000.00		
FY2021 (Est. Net)	\$	909,378.12	\$	1,500,000.00	\$ (590,621.88)	
Estimated revenue:		Gross		Net		
FY22	\$	1,401,278	\$	1,331,252		
FY23	\$	1,401,278	\$	1,331,252		
	\$	2,802,556	\$	2,662,505		

<sup>\* -</sup> FY20 first year to show net figures, all years prior, through FY19 = gross figures.



### **City of Berkeley Soda Tax Revenue-FY 2020**

### For the Months of July 2019 - June 2020 Presented to the SSBPPE Commission on 1.21.2021

Month	Amount	
Jul-19	117,276.00	
Aug-19	136,505.87	
Sep-19	129,384.50	
Oct-19	113,242.67	
Nov-19	146,773.53	
Dec-19	146,013.74	
Jan-20	121,333.67	
Feb-20	125,336.18	
Mar-20	92,675.68	Post-shutdown
Apr-20	101,524.50	
May-20	64,301.87	
Jun-20	83,828.25	
Gross Revenue	\$ 1,378,196.46	
Less: 2% Fees	\$ (27,563.93)	
Less: Finance	\$ (42,000.00)	
Net Revenue	\$ 1,308,632.53	

242,986.39

FY 2015	\$ 242,986.39
FY 2016	1,757,271.70
FY 2017	1,578,389.00
FY 2018	1,517,949.28
FY 2019	-
FY 2020	1,308,632.53
Total	\$ 6,405,228.90

<sup>\*</sup> Italicized years are net, not gross revenue figures.





## City of Berkeley Soda Tax Revenue-FY 2021

### For the Months of July 2020 - June 2021

### Pesented to the SSBPPE Commission on 1/21/2021

Month	Amount
Jul-20	77,220.73
Aug-20	76,953.28
Sep-20	108,071.92
Oct-20	87,711.55
Nov-20	
Dec-20	
Jan-21	
Feb-21	
Mar-21	
Apr-21	
May-21	
Jun-21	
Gross Revenue	\$ 349,957.48
Less: 2% Fees	\$ (6,999.15)
Less: Finance	\$ (14,000.00)
Net Revenue	\$ 328,958.33

(2% of gross revenue collected) (1/3 of \$42,000)

FY 2015	\$ 242,986.39
FY 2016	\$ 1,757,271.70
FY 2017	\$ 1,578,389.00
FY 2018	\$ 1,517,949.28
FY 2019	\$ 1,606,177.73
FY 2020 (net)	\$ 1,308,632.53
FY 2021 (net YTD)	\$ 328,958.33
Total	\$ 8,340,364.96

### Variance FY20 pre-COVID to FY21 post shutdown

FY20	Actual Rev	Var. from FY21
Jul-19	\$ 117,276.00	\$ (40,055.27)
Aug-19	\$ 136,505.87	\$ (59,552.59)
Sep-19	\$ 129,384.50	\$ (21,312.58)
Oct-19	\$ 113,242.67	\$ (25,531.12)
	\$ 496,409.04	\$ (146,451.56)

-30%