

FAX number (916) 341-5620

22 March 2013

ATTN: Jeanine Townsend  
Clerk to the Board  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Sacramento, California



This letter is in reference to the Public Comment on the Adequacy of the Draft Substitute Environmental Document.

I am of Turlock, which is in *Phase One*, of the State Water Board's Substitute Environmental Document (SED) for control of rivers and dams.

Since others will address specific issues concerning SED, I have chosen to address issues of principle.

The California Constitution, Article X, Section 2, Water. Instructs, "...the general welfare requires that the water resources of the State be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use of water be prevented, and that the conservation of such waters is to be exercised with a view to the reasonable and beneficial use thereof in the interest of the people and for the public welfare. The right to water or to the use of flow of water in or from any natural stream or water course in this State is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water."

Some most important key words and phrases are beneficial, fullest extent, unreasonable, conservation, reasonable and **INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE, PUBLIC WELFARE** and **GENERAL WELFARE**.

Since humans, and not fish, are the intelligent species on Planet Earth and therefore at the top of the food chain, it is ASSUMED that both public and general welfare is referring to humans and not to fish.

If the State Water Board obtains authority for SED, the result will be LACK OF WATER to farmers.

Farmland will decrease. Farmers, including generational farmers, will decrease. Any supporting and related businesses will also decrease. In effect, the State Water Board will be STEALING property, goods, services and livelihoods from a vast multitude of people. Stealing, destroying or otherwise denying one what is legally theirs through manipulation or otherwise is illegal.

The Preamble of the California Constitution states, in part, "We, the People of the State of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom..." God is acknowledged.

Article I, Section 1. of our State Constitution states, in part, "All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights (as from God). Among these are...acquiring, possessing, and protecting property...." The right to private property ownership is acknowledged.

The United Nations Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, which is commonly known as Agenda 21, which is commonly known as Sustainable Development, Sustainable Communities and Sustainable Growth, is a plan for world governance, by controlling world resources, including water and people, by using the environment as an excuse to manipulate, and it has reached down into the United States of America and the State of California, including local areas. It is a Socialist plan, which is anti-private property. It is Communism!

Don't take my word for it. Place the keys words "Agenda 21" into your search engine. The first links should be to the United Nations as it is their document. Do it. Read it.

This has been in development for decades.

The members of the State Water Board are either unknowingly, or knowingly, the instrument to promote and implement the water resource and anti-private property tentacles of Agenda 21.

The SED is un-Constitutional, illegal, immoral in recognition of God and promoting a foreign agenda in the control of a natural resource and the destruction of private property to control the resources and thereby the people of California.

As such it should not even be in the process to even have consideration for being implemented.

It is my assumption that primary research was not accomplished to ascertain if such a document is constitutional much less having illegal results. Are State personnel so busy asking, "What can we do?" that they forget to ask, "Should we do it?" They should also ask, "Where did this idea come from and is it a good source?"

Sincerely,



Donald Jeffries