

COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

WEEK OF DECEMBER 1-7, 2013

FEE INCREASES

MORE WATER RESTRICTIONS

(A WELL METER IS PROBABLY COMING YOUR WAY)

UPDATED FIRE CODE, STORM WATER, AND ROOF BARRIER REGS

PASO BASIN ORDINANCE LAWSUITS

(SEE PAGE 9)

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, November 26, 2013 (Completed)

Item 33 - Resolution Regarding a Vested Right to Complete Site Preparation, Planting, or Sale of Product under Ordinance No. 3246 (Paso Basin Emergency Water Moratorium Ordinance). The Board of Supervisors adopted a vesting resolution by a 5/0 vote. The resolution allows farmers who had invested in developing a project and /or who had completed substantial work prior to August 27, 2013 to apply for an exemption from the Paso Water Basin moratorium. Key changes that were made from the submitted version included:

- Exemption of Properties of 20 acres or less. While this is a positive step, it could become legally problematical for the County because it constitutes a de facto change to the actual Paso Basin Emergency Water Moratorium Ordinance. The ordinance does not contain language that allows the County to exempt properties based on size.
- Elimination of certain proposed criteria for approval of vesting because they were viewed as unmeasurable. These changes reduce the number of available criteria from which a farmer can select to attempt to assert qualification for vesting.

A full discussion of both the vesting provision and the ordinance is contained in last week's Update on page 2, which can be accessed at the link:

http://www.colabslo.org/prior_actions/Weekly_Update_Nov_24-30.pdf

A Copy of the final adopted vesting language can be found at the link:

<http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PL/PR+Groundwater/Vesting+Rights+Exemption+Procedure.pdf>

Related Context

Gibson Denies Speakers/Violates Open Meeting Law: The vesting resolution was scheduled on the agenda for 1:30 PM. Chairman Gibson has been strict about requiring speakers not to talk about matters scheduled on the agenda during general public comment. For this reason a number of speakers came in the morning prepared to talk about the water moratorium ordinance in general and then planned to make their comments on the separate vesting resolution during the afternoon, when it was specifically scheduled.

Not surprisingly, and in violation of his own stated process, Gibson said they could not speak on the water ordinance because it was subsumed in the item on vesting, which was scheduled in the afternoon. Speaker after speaker objected to no avail.

County Violates Law in Adopting Vesting Resolution: In a revealing statement, Gibson said that the vesting issue was part and parcel of the ordinance issue and that the speakers could cover any and all of it under the vesting issue at 1:30. The legal problem is that, as stated above, the state enabling legislation on emergency ordinances prohibits an emergency ordinance from being amended once adopted. Clearly in Gibson's mind, and no matter what he says later, the vesting resolution is a de facto amendment of the ordinance. His ruling and the Board's acceptance clearly confirm their underlying deep mindset and belief of this fact.

Supervisor Arnold's Question and County Council's Convoluted Evasion: Supervisor Arnold actually stopped the process and asked why the people could not speak and pointed out that if the vesting resolution was truly separate and not an amendment of the ordinance, the people should be allowed to speak on the ordinance generally. Gibson remained adamant, and the rest of the Board (except for Arnold) acquiesced. County Counsel Rita Neal was asked what to do. In a rambling and confusing answer, she said it was a grey area and that the Chair "had wide discretion." She was clearly nervous about being put on the spot. Her real duty was to uphold the law (whether Gibson and his cronies liked it or not) and advise them "that in the interest of the law and spirit of the open meeting law and to err on the side of forestalling a legal problem, the Board should let the people speak." An important part of County Counsel's job is to protect the Board (and the taxpayers) from future litigation whether the Board likes it or not.

Lawyers in the audience who oppose the Water Moratorium Ordinance were licking their chops. As for Neal, remember that she facilitated the work around a rationale that allowed Gibson to return his administrative aide to his office and the County payroll.

Strike Two, Ms. Neal!!!!



On October 8, 2013, COLAB and a number of other organizations and individuals strongly recommended that the Board not adopt the urgency water moratorium ordinance until it had worked out the vesting issue. Supervisor Arnold was the only one who stood strong on the issue and abstained from voting on the ordinance, in part, because of the Board's refusal to deal with the vesting problem. In this sense she was the only one watching out for the taxpayers, who hold the ultimate bag for litigation costs and settlements.

Certainly the Board of Supervisors was precipitous and reckless in adopting such a severe ordinance without having these details presented and discussed.

Again and as we have pointed out repeatedly, the urgency ordinance, the vesting resolution, and all the rest of the effort is really not about water. It is about shutting down business, shutting down agriculture, and constraining property rights while promoting "smart growth."

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, December 3, 2013 (Scheduled)
--

Item 2 - First Quarter Financial Report. The report indicates that the County is on track with both revenues and expenditures for the first 3 months of its fiscal year 2013-14. Building permit revenues are up, which suggests that there is a pick-up in the economy. Airport boardings show a slight improvement over this time last year. There are many unanswered questions about the impact of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), Obama Care, on caseloads and revenues as the State changes reimbursement formulae to counties.

Item 12 - 2013 Action for Healthy Communities Report. This item could be of interest because it may provide data on the state of poverty in the County, which in turn is related to economic conditions that are in part a function of the County's land use strategies, processing requirements, and applicant costs. The write-up indicates that the study will not be posted until December 3, 2013, the day of the Board meeting. This results in the public not having an opportunity to review the data in advance. It will supposedly appear on the link: [2013 ACTION for Healthy Communities Report](#)

Readers will remember that there are similar reports about homelessness that beget a degree of handwringing but little action on the land use front in terms of generating homeless housing in any meaningful amount.

Item 13 - 2014 Fee Increases. The County has 2,016 fees that it charges for various services which range across all its activities. Many of the fees are for services which citizens can access voluntarily for use of parks, golf courses, boat ramps, facility rentals, and similar activities. Other fees are charged for mental health services and clinical medical services and are often actually paid by Medi-Cal, Medicare, and soon possibly by Affordable Health Care Act (ACA-Obama Care) mandated insurance. The County

also charges other governments for services. Internally, County departments charge each other for many services. This is a particularly important way for the County to recover intergovernmental revenue from State and Federal mandated programs. For example, a Department such as Social Services, which is mandated to provide welfare payments, child protective services, foster care, and so forth, receives funding from the higher levels of government for these programs. To operate the programs the County must develop formulae for charging the overhead for support services such as building maintenance, fleet services, financial services, etc. In some cases there needs to be a fee structure to justify the charges.

Regulatory Fees: A category of fees of most concern to COLAB are the regulatory fees charged to individuals and businesses to cover the costs of permitting, inspections, licensing, and operating permits. The County must maintain expert staffs and supporting services in Planning and Development, Agriculture Commissioner, Public Health, and Public Works to undertake these activities. Its goal is to charge fees to cover the costs so that precious local general fund dollars from the property tax, sales tax, and hotel tax are not used but are reserved to cover the costs of basic local service, such as Sheriff, Jail, Probation, Fire, District Attorney, Public Defender, road maintenance, and basic internal support systems, such as Auditor Controller, County Counsel, County Administrator, and the Board itself.

After the adoption of Proposition 13 in 1978, which capped the property tax rate at 1% and limited the growth of assessed values to a max of 2% or less per year, fees expanded exponentially as a way of funding many services, including regulatory services. Simultaneously, and over the following decades, the scope of local government regulation also expanded exponentially, especially in areas related to land use, business operations, agricultural operations, and now the ever-expanding environmental regulations. Greenhouse gas regulation has opened a vast new field of permits, inspections, enforcement, and concomitant cost and fees.

In fact, a crushing government/consultant/legal “industry” has been created which has driven home prices off the charts, crippled manufacturing, cost millions of jobs, and relegates millions of citizens to poverty and dependence on government support. As the CEO of CKE Restaurants (Hardees and Carl’s Jr.) states, it’s much easier to open a Carl’s Jr. in Shanghai than in California.

For years the County raised fees with relentless regularity. In fact the staff report on this item states that 73% of the fees are high enough to cover the related service and/or inspection costs. This year the Staff recommends raising 288 of the fees, lowering 150, and adding 34 new fees. The chart below is an illustrative sample of some environmental health annual permit fees. For example, in addition to paying fees to Planning for various reviews, a builder proposing a new subdivision must also pay for reviews by Fire, Public Works, Sheriff, APCD, and in the illustration below \$ 1,812 for review by the Health Department of its sewer plans. That fee is proposed to be raised to \$2,138 starting in July 2014.

COLAB questions why such reviews cost so much, why the fee is going up (when the staff has had no raises), and whether the current method of review (other than the State requires counties to them – which is not an analytical logic reason) is appropriate.

Department Name: Health Agency - Public Health - Environmental Health
Fund Center: 16002

Fee Indicator #	Fee Category	Fee Description	Authority	2013-14 Current Fee	Unit Desc.	2014-15 Proposed Fee	Unit Desc.	% Change	Comments
6010	Increased	Tract Maps (Public Water & Onsite Sewage disposal)		\$1,495.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$1,537.00	project plus \$107/hr	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6011	Increased	Tract Maps (Private water & Onsite sewage disposal)		\$1,812.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$2,138.00	project plus \$107/hr	18%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnotes 2 & 3
6012	Increased	Shared Water Systems 2-4 Service Connections		\$288.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$340.00	project plus \$107/hr	18%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnotes 2 & 3
6013	Increased	Parcel Maps (Public Water & Sewer)		\$691.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$711.00	project plus \$107/hr	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6014	Increased	Parcel Maps (Public Water & on site sewer disposal)		\$887.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$912.00	project plus \$107/hr	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6015	Increased	Parcel Maps (Private water & on site sewage disposal)		\$1,445.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$1,485.00	project plus \$107/hr	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6016	Increased	Lot Line Adjustments		\$497.00	project plus \$106/hr	\$511.00	project plus \$107/hr	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6017	Increased	Planning Department Pre-application Meeting		\$522.00	per project	\$537.00	per project	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6018	Increased	Building Department Pre-application Meeting		\$587.00	per project	\$604.00	per project	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6019	Increased	Certificate of Compliance Review		\$507.00	per review	\$522.00	per review	3%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnote 2
6020	Increased	Verification of Primary Drinking Water Stds		\$173.00	per verification	\$204.00	per verification	18%	Fee collected by Planning Dept. See footnotes 2 & 3
		Public Swimming Pool/Spa	SLO County Code Chapter 8.60						See footnote 8
		Public Swimming Pool/Spa New Construction							

Page 46 of 74

- a. What if this work were bid out to private firms on a competitive basis?
- b. Who is more qualified to review the plan – the applicants’ licensed civil engineer who must stake his/her career and license on the line by placing his/her seal on the plan or a County technician?
- c. Should the County, as its contribution to affordable housing, waive such fees for projects that contain affordable workforce housing? Or does this stuff exist in a disconnected policy vacuum.
- d. The Board should consider the fee increases in this broader policy context and reject them all.
- e. The Board should direct management to deal with increasing costs by structured process improvement, eliminating non-value adding steps and tasks, velocity improvements, reduction in absenteeism, managed competitive privatization, and providing bonuses to work teams that reduce costs and fees—not fee increases.

Imagine – it costs \$2,138 (+ \$107/hour for each extra if it goes over the “normal” time) for a public health technician to review a sewer plan that has been prepared by an expert.

You can stay in a waterfront luxury “cabin” at the Tahoe Hyatt (in Incline) with the use of all its amenities (beach, pools, fire pits, sports facilities, beautiful lakefront grounds, etc., for 5 days for the same price, and they make money and give you credits for the next stay!!!

The County doesn’t even give you champagne at check in!



Hyatt Lake Front

Item 14 - Update On Status of the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) of the General Plan as It Relates to Water Matters and the Adoption of Paso Robles Water Basin Urgency Ordinance. The Planning Department needs additional staff to implement various portions of the COSE relating to water conservation and management. Specifically, it needs more staff to implement various provisions and consequences of the Paso Robles Basin Urgency Ordinance water moratorium.

More significantly, the staff recommends work program changes linked to existing COSE goals, which implement the Paso Basin Ordinance and seek simultaneously to expand its principles to the rest of the unincorporated County. Some of this has very profound policy implications and should be studied by anyone with property, a farm, a ranch, or a vineyard, and anyone who is a builder or a developer, who has estate issues, who lives anywhere in the unincorporated County, or who cares about property rights. Some “highlights” of this new assault include:

Larger Minimum parcel sizes

More pumping restrictions

Well meters

Require applications for land divisions, which would increase density or intensity in groundwater basins with recommended or certified Levels of Severity II or III for water supply or water systems and are not in adjudication, to include a water supply assessment (WSA) prepared by the applicable urban water supplier (as defined by California Water Code.

Implementation Strategy WR 2.2.2 Improve well permit data collection Improve data obtained from well permit applications regarding location, depth, yield, use, flow direction, and water levels.

Condition discretionary land use permits for new, non-agricultural uses in groundwater basins with a recommended or certified Level of Severity I, II, or III to monitor and report water use to the Department of Planning and Building on an annual basis for use in the Resource Management System.

Develop and adopt a countywide water conservation ordinance that includes:

- water efficiency and conservation standards for new development*
- retrofit-upon-sale of existing residential and commercial property.*

To implement strategies. Above : Pass an ordinance which includes:

- amending the water efficient landscape standards in place in the ordinance to include all new development (including those on existing lots) and both front and back yard landscaping (this effort was recently postponed to allow work on other priority items)*
- increasing water efficiency beyond the requirements of Cal Green*
- creating a retrofit upon sale program for all properties in the County*
- metering and monitoring all of new wells in the County*
- metering and monitoring of existing wells in the County*
- requiring that all new development in the County (both ministerial and discretionary)*

Item 15 - FY 2014-15 Budget Goals and Policies, Budget Balancing Strategies and Approaches, and Board Priorities. This item provides the Board of Supervisors with an opportunity to set budgetary policies in general and to provide specific direction for preparation of the FY 2014-15 Annual Operating and Capital Improvement Budgets. This year's version is a continuation of the County's generally conservative approach, which requires submission of a balanced budget and avoidance of the use of reserves, and which maintains funding of public safety departments as the top priority.

New this year is a discussion of how to manage the projected \$8 million revenue shortfall which would eventually occur if the Diablo Nuclear Power Plant closes. The staff write-up suggests that it is not too much of a problem because the County has \$88 million in unrestricted/unobligated reserves.

With \$88.4 million in unrestricted reserves, the County maintains funding that can be used to balance the budget in difficult economic times, including a decrease in revenue as the result of a potential closure of Diablo Canyon. If the County were to set aside an

additional two years of funding for Diablo Canyon (\$17.8 million), the ratio of reserves to the County General Fund operating budget would increase to 30%.

Item 20 - Hearing to Consider Adoption of Ordinance Amending Chapter 16.10 of The San Luis Obispo County Code by Adopting and Amending the 2013 Edition Of The California Fire Code; And Request for Use of Alternative Publication Procedures as Authorized by Government Code Section 25124. The write-up states that, for the most part, there is little substantive change in the requirements. It further states that the main effort was to convert the section on structural sprinkler requirements from hard-to-understand text to a comprehensive table. The table is clear and can be accessed at the link:

<http://agenda.slocounty.ca.gov/agenda/sanluisobispo/2801/U0xPIENvdW50eSAyMDEzIHdpdGggbGluZXMucGRm/12/n/21776.doc>

The reader will have to scroll down through the ordinance to see the new table. Builders and development professionals should check to make sure that new requirements have not been added.

Item 21 - Hearing to Consider a Request by the County of San Luis Obispo to Amend the Safety Element of the County General Plan to Incorporate by Reference the Adopted San Luis Obispo County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and to Amend Titles 19 (Building and Construction Ordinance), 22 (Land Use Ordinance), and 23 (Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance) of the County Code in Order to (1) Implement the Post Construction Requirements Adopted by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board; and (2) Adopt Revisions to the Grading Ordinance Within the Coastal Zone. Among other changes, this item adds new construction requirements for the management of stormwater onsite. Developers and builders will be required to develop storm water management plans. The item indicates that the requirement has been imposed on the County by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB). The Board letter states:

□ The Stormwater Control Plan is reviewed for compliance with the Central Coast Post-Construction Requirements. The County reviews the plans to ensure compliance with the Post-Construction Requirements. Depending on the amount of impervious surfacing proposed, the following performance requirements can be triggered:

Impervious Surface Area	Performance Standard			
	Site Design and Runoff Reduction	Water Quality	Runoff Retention	Peak Management
≥ 2,500 sq ft	•			
≥ 5,000 sq ft (except SFR ¹)	•	•		
≥ 15,000 sq ft	•	•	•	
≥ 22,500 sq ft	•	•	•	•

In most cases, the applicant will require the assistance of a Civil Engineer and/or Geotechnical Engineer in order to supply the necessary information.

- **A maintenance agreement is required for structural stormwater devices.** Some projects will require structural stormwater devices – e.g. retention basins, constructed wetlands, bioswales, filter strips, etc. Unless adequately maintained over time, these structures may not function as designed. In order to ensure the long-term functionality of these devices the applicant will be required to enter into a maintenance agreement. This maintenance agreement will include annual reporting and certification to the County. The County, in turn, must report on compliance to the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Some Questions:

- a. Did the County support or oppose this new regulation at the CCRWQCB?
- b. Has the County studied and forecast the typical number of new projects that will be subjected to these requirements each year?
- c. Has the County studied the costs that will be imposed on builder's to comply?
- d. Has the County studied the cost impact on new home and apartment house construction?
- e. What will be the cost of the fees imposed by the County to review plans and then conduct follow-up inspections?
- g. How does adoption of these new regulations impact the County's stated support for affordable and workforce housing?

Executive Session - Paso Basin Water Lawsuits (2)

A group of landowners within the Paso Robles Water Basin, Paso Robles Water Integrity Network (PR-WIN), has filed a lawsuit in the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court seeking to overturn the Board of Supervisors precipitous and illegal adoption of an urgency ordinance imposing a water moratorium on farmers and homeowners. Essentially the owners request:

1. An immediate stay of Ordinances 3246 and 3247 (the urgency ordinances) pending resolution of the litigation.
2. A peremptory writ of mandate commanding the County to rescind the ordinances.
3. Reasonable attorneys' fees and coats of the suit.

A second action (Complaint for Quiet Title) has been filed by a group called Protect Our Water Rights (POWR) against the County, Community Services Area 16-1, San Miguel Community Services District, Atascadero Mutual Water Company, Templeton Community Services District, and DOES 1-200. The DOES are included because, at this point, it is not known what individuals and corporations other than

the County and the municipal water providers (which are named) are illegally trying to appropriate (steal) the farmers' and homeowners' water.

Essentially, the County moratorium allows these entities and private parties unfettered use of the farmers' water, while prohibiting the farmers from using it unless they can comply with expensive and often impossible requirements to extinguish the use of water elsewhere in the basin (so called offsets).

Again, the pleading is for the Court to enjoin the County from enforcing its ordinance while the litigation is pending and to confirm the property owner's superior status per California water law versus the municipal appropriators.

A major question is should the Board defend the County against the lawsuits. A threshold issue during the Executive Session will be a determination on whether to mount a defense or to agree to rescind the Paso Water Basin Urgency Ordinance and actually endorse and support the Quiet Title request of many property owners. This is a very important decision and the public has the right to know how each Supervisor voted on that decision. The County Counsel usually comes out after closed session and reports that "no reportable action has been taken" unless the case has been settled and/or a decision reached by a court. In this case the matter does not involve damages or a request for compensation (other than legal costs). Instead, it is a matter of major public policy, and the Board should insist that its decision be made public and that the vote and reasoning of each Board member be made public.

An even better process would be for the Board to waive its pending litigation privilege and make its decision with a full public debate in the open. The Board is always talking about transparency. Here's a chance to demonstrate how transparent they really are.

We will report in detail in the December 2013 COLAB Newsletter.

<p>San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments (SLOCOG) Meeting of Wednesday, December 4, 2013, 8:30 AM (Scheduled)</p>
--

Item B-3, Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Financial Expectations and Projections. This document is extremely important and has many long-term implications for local and countywide road funding. It also once again raises the specter of requesting the voters to impose a one-half cent sales tax over 20 to 30 years to provide local match for State funding of major highway projects such as the widening of Highway 101. The draft document contains considerable data about gasoline taxes, miles traveled, and transit alternatives.

Readers may remember that a separate plan, called the Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS), must ultimately be included in the RTP. The SCS must comport with SB 375, which requires that counties and cities demonstrate how they will reduce the

number of trips by cars and light trucks – particularly through less commuting by car. The SCS must be approved by the California Air Resources Board staff CARB). A jurisdiction without an approved SCS cannot have a valid RTP. This would result in ineligibility for State and Federal transportation funds. In turn this has profound implications for land use policies of the cities and County because it supports “smart growth” compact, stack-and-pack housing. It also will attempt to force people out of their cars and onto mass transit.

The current item is one sub-part of the process and is worth a quick read by anyone with a stake in land use or economic success, as well as broader issues of private property rights and government regulation/costs. Some key quotes:

Executive Summary

A total of \$1.82B is projected to be available for transportation expenditures through Federal, State and local fund programs over the next 20 years. A significant number of changes to Federal, State, and Local Funds have occurred since the previous 2010 RTP/PSCS leading to consolidation or elimination of funds previously received by SLOCOG. Absent a fix to the Highway Trust Fund, and local government levels remain constant, the total revenues available for transportation would be approximately \$1.5B. If a local option sales tax was approved by voters and the reasonable-assumptions hold, the total available for transportation would be approximately \$2.4B.

Major Policy Recommendations:

- 1. Prioritize SLOCOG’s Highway funds (RTIP) to Highway Improvements (previously some were used for Street/Road Improvements).*
- 2. Require a significant local match for future interchange improvements. Assumes increase in local funding from \$44M (2005) to \$103M (2014).*
- 3. Major improvements to US 101 mainline (freeway conversion, widening) requires significant State funding (none is assumed).*
- 4. Consider increasing Transportation Funds (LTF is an increasing revenue source) for Transit.*
- 5. Local Street / Road Maintenance is a local responsibility.*
- 6. Local Street / Road Improvements is a growing local responsibility.*
- 7. Maintain levels of funding for Rideshare and Active Transportation.*
- 8. Pursue Supplemental Funding to improve the system and reduce the burden on local jurisdictions. A ½ cent sales tax would raise an additional \$500M-\$600M over 20 years.*

If current levels of RTP funding for local road maintenance are reduced, where will the dollars come from? What is the County’s plan to grow its local revenue sources to fill the gap? Its road level of service rating quality is already in the 50’s out of 100.

The loss of over \$8 million if the Diablo Nuclear Power Plant closes certainly won't help. Who is connecting the policy dots?

The full document can be read at the link:

https://library.slocog.org/PDFs/AGENCY_MTGS_AGENDAS/SLOCOGBOARD/2013/December%202013/B-3%20ATTACHMENT%20Draft%202014%20RTP.pdf

**IMPORTANT WATER BOARD HEARING ON
DECEMBER 5TH AND 6TH IN SLO
(BUT YOU HAD TO FILE IN WRITING BY NOV 22, 2013 OR
YOU CAN'T SPEAK)**

It appears that item 6, which is the most important issue, will be heard on the morning of December 5th.

Interested Parties:

The Central Coast Water Board will hold a public meeting on December 5-6, 2013 in San Luis Obispo, including the following items related to the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program:

- Item 6 – Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Irrigated Lands, Revision to Condition 65, Public Disclosure of Well Locations
- Item 17 – Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program Update
- Item 18 – Central Coast Groundwater Coalition Update
- Item 19 – Results of PG&E Grant, Optimizing Irrigation and Nitrogen Management in Strawberries for Improved Water Quality