

## Supervisors Sue Their Own Clerk To Block Voter-Mandated Cuts To Their Pay

By Mark Gutglueck

Less than a month after more than two-thirds of San Bernardino County's voters passed Measure K, which calls for those elected as county supervisors going forward to be limited to one four-year term in office and have their total salaries and benefits limited to \$60,000 per year, the board of supervisors this week took legal action to prevent the measure's

provisions from going into effect.

In taking the extremely rare legal action of challenging voter-approved legislation, county officials insisted that preserving the current pay of the members of the board of supervisors – whose total annual compensation ranges from \$242,941.27 to \$280,905.92 – is a matter of maintaining good governance.

In initiating the litigation, the board of supervisors filed suit not against the Red Brennan Group, which sponsored Measure K, but rather, somewhat surprisingly, against their own immediate employee, Lynna Monell, the clerk of the board of supervisors of San Bernardino County. The legal action, nonetheless, was ultimately aimed at the Red Brennan Group, as included

in the suit are Does 1 through 100, inclusive, among whom the *Sentinel* is informed, will be any and all members of the Red Brennan Group to eventually be identified by the county. The county is, the *Sentinel* was told, currently compiling a list of the Red Brennan Group's membership. The intent is to seek a substantial monetary award from the Red Brennan Group

and each of its members, both as a punishment for having pursued the passage of Measure K, and as an intimidation tactic the supervisors hope will convince a substantial number of the group's members to depart, such that the movement the Red Brennan Group represents will be divided and thus overcome.

The board of supervisors is represented in its legal action by **See P 2**

## Third Lawsuit This Year Coming Over Upland's Approval Of Project Without EIR

A group of residents this week appealed the November 18 Upland Planning Commission's environmental certification of a warehouse project on 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the city's west side in close proximity to a nearly completed residential project of 318 single family dwelling units and another residential project consisting of 192

town homes and condominiums.

That appeal of the planning commission's acceptance of a mitigated negative declaration for Yellow Iron Development's 92,275-square foot warehouse building, which is to include 11 truck bays and two other truck loading facilities as well as parking spaces for 202 vehicles, pre-

sumably for those to be employed at the warehouse, signaled the intention of those opposed to the project to sue the city over its acceptance of the project. That lawsuit, the *Sentinel* was informed, will be based in some measure on city officials' refusal of citizen requests that a full-blown environmental impact report on the

project be carried out.

The Yellow Iron Development warehouse project is the third highly controversial land use decision that is being passed without a full-blown environmental impact report being completed in the past year. Instead, like Bridge Development Partners' Amazon warehouse project and the Villa

Serena residential development, both approved in April, the project approved on November 18 was given environmental certification by means of a mitigated negative declaration. A mitigated negative declaration utilizes the city's elected officials in the form of the city council or the appointed members of the planning com- **See P 2**

## Chino Hills & Hesperia Appoint Mayors To Head Cities In 2021

The city councils in Chino Hills and Hesperia have made early mayoral appointments, in each case delegating the youngest member of their respective panels to preside over their meetings for the next year.

On November 24, the Chino Hills City Council elevated Brian Johsz as mayor going forward into 2021. Johsz's appointment was unanimous.

In Hesperia on December 1, Cameron Gregg was made mayor on a 4-to-1 vote of the city council.

In most of San Bernardino County's municipalities, the mayor is directly elected by the residents. In the cities of Chino Hills, Loma Linda, Highland, Yucaipa, Twentynine Palms, Big Bear Lake, Hesperia and Victorville and in the towns of Apple **See P 12**

## Forest Association, Audobon Society & Sierra Club Sue To Nix Church of The Woods Project

Last Month, the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, the San Bernardino Mountains Group of the Sierra Club and the Save Our Forest Association, Inc. filed a legal action against the County of San Bernardino's approval of the Church of the Woods plan to build a campus on an undeveloped property in the San Bernardino Mountains community of Rimfor-

est.

The lawsuit cites numerous violations of the California Environmental Quality Act and what those groups assert is the project's inconsistency with the county's general plan and Lake Arrowhead Community Plan.

According to Hugh Bialecki of Save Our Forest Association, "The project would devastate a tranquil forest refuge just east of Rimforest.

A wooded hilltop along scenic State Route 18 would be graded flat. Old-growth trees and habitat for rare and sensitive wildlife would be permanently lost. Hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of dirt would be dumped across the headwaters of Little Bear Creek, which drains into Lake Arrowhead. The project's massive grading across steep slopes in this headwa- **See P 11**

## San Bernardino County Now Hosting 10<sup>th</sup> Largest Number Of COVID Carriers

San Bernardino County holds the unenviable distinction of falling within the top ten counties in the country in terms of the number of its residents testing positive with COVID-19. According to statistics provided by the National Center For Disease Control, as of late this week, San Bernardino County crossed the threshold of being the tenth county

in the United States with over 100,000 coronavirus cases.

As of today, according to health officials, there have been 100,733 county residents confirmed to have come down with COVID-19.

The rate of infection locally has grown so acute that San Bernardino County emergency system operators are no longer dispatching am-

balances in response to the lion's share of what come in as emergency medical calls. Unless those seeking emergency response because of coronavirus symptoms are critical, the call centers are vectoring those seeking assistance to other modes of treatment, or referring them to their family/normal care physicians. Part of the rationale for

that strategy is to guard against exposing emergency and medical personnel to virus carriers who could infect them and thus render them unable to function in their capacities

Those believed to have contracted COVID-19 under the age of 65 who do not have complicating or problematic medical conditions are being told to remain in

place at home, to isolate and get medical treatment in accordance with that provided by their insurance carriers.

In general, even when there are no grounds to believe the caller is infected with the coronavirus, those who are not in dire danger are being told to seek care outside of that provided by emergency personnel.

The states of **See P 2**

## Final City & Town Council Election Results

The final certified results of the November 3 election have been released by the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters Office, indicating that 21 new city council members or mayors throughout the county will be sworn into office later this month.

In Adelanto, incumbent Joy Jeannette hung onto her council post with 2,060 votes or 15.43 percent of those cast. Planning Commissioner Daniel Ramos captured first in the field of ten candidates, registering 2,858 votes or 21.41 percent of the 13,347 total votes cast. He will replace incumbent Ed Camargo, who did not run this year. Also-rans in the race were Diane Esmeralda with 1,910 votes or 14.31 percent; Tonya Edwards, with 1,427 votes or 10.69 percent; Tracy Hernandez, with 1,084 votes or 8.12 percent; Jacquelin Diaz, with 684 votes or 5.1 percent; Roy Isaiah II with 391 votes or 2.93 percent; Dominic Cisneros, with 592 votes or 4.44 percent; Edward Reyes, with 504 votes or 3.78 percent; and Planning Commissioner Jay-Shawn Johnson, with 1,837 votes or 13.76 percent.

In Apple Valley, incumbents Larry Cusack and Art Bishop were unopposed in their District 1 and District 2 races.

In Barstow, incumbent Mayor Julie Hackbarth-McIntyre, with 2,199 or 31.58 percent of the 6,964 votes cast, was chased from office by Paul Anthony Courtney, with 3,040 votes or 43.65 percent. Running in third and fourth in the races were Nahaniel H. Pickett, Sr. with 911 votes or 13.08 percent and Virginia **See P 3**

## Board Of Supervisors, Faced With Voter Imposed Mandate To Cut Its Members' Annual Pay To One-Fourth Of Its Current Quarter Of A Million Dollars, Sues Its Own Clerk To Halt Implementation Of The Reductions *from front page*

the Los Angeles-based Sutton Law Firm and three of its attorneys, Bradley Hertz, James Sutton and Nicholas Sanders.

In its petition filed on December 2, the board of supervisors requested that "this court award petitioner the costs of this proceeding; and that this court grant petitioner such other, different, or further relief as the court may deem just and proper."

The Red Brennan Group asserted that the county's move is a cynical ploy to simply keep the pay level for the county's ruling elite intact.

In the petition, Hertz, Sutton and Sanders maintain on the board of supervisors' behalf that only the board of supervisors can determine its members' pay; that the supervisors have a constitutional right to serve as many terms as they personally wish as long as they can maintain the support of the voters in doing so; that the

Red Brennan Group, as Measure K's proponents, packed too many provisions into the measure; and that Measure K interferes with the operation of county government.

According to the board's writ of mandate petition, "Measure K suffers from the following fatal flaws, which make it unconstitutional, legally invalid, and/or otherwise unenforceable: (a) Measure K violates Article XI, Section 1(b) of the California Constitution, which requires that county boards of supervisors, and not the voters via the initiative process, shall prescribe supervisors' compensation; (b) Measure K violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution by purporting to enact a single lifetime term limit provision for members of the county board of supervisors; (c) Measure K violates the initiative power of the electorate by intruding on matters that are ex-

clusively delegated to the local governing body; (d) Measure K violates Article II, Section 8(d) of the California Constitution by embracing more than a single subject; (e) Measure K violates Article XI, Section 4(d) of the California Constitution, and California Government Code Sections 25000, et. seq, by impairing essential government functions; (f) Measure K violates California Government Code Section 36502(b)'s prohibition on retroactive term limits; (g) Measure K violates California Government Code Section 1235's prohibition on the adjustment of sitting officials' salaries; and/or (h) Measure K violates the law because its term limit provision is not severable from its compensation provision."

According to the petition for the writ of mandate, "Accordingly, and as alleged herein, petitioner/plaintiff Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino seeks judicial relief by way of: (1) a writ of mandate compelling respondents and defendants not to take any actions that would cause the implementation of Measure K's provisions; (2) in-

clusive relief preventing respondents and defendants from taking any actions that would cause the implementation of Measure K's provisions; (3) a judicial declaration that Measure K is invalid and unenforceable; (4) a judicial declaration that if Measure K is valid and enforceable, its provisions do not take effect until 2022 at the earliest; and (5) such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper."

Noting that "For Fiscal Year 2019-2020, the county has an adopted modified

budget of \$7.238 billion" and that "For Fiscal Year 2020-2021, the county has a recommended budget of \$6.997 billion," the petition states, "Given the size and complexity of San Bernardino County, the office of supervisor is recognized as a position that requires a considerable investment of time and due diligence from board members in order to effectively fulfill their duties in service to the public. These duties include but are not limited to: ensuring fiscal responsibility; representing the interest of the public during public meetings and hearings of the board of supervisors

## The San Bernardino County

# Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.  
The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with

Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

**Call (951) 567-1936**

**to learn of locations where the Sentinel is available or to provide news tips**

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 909 957 9998

Message Line 909-276 5796

and other public committees; participating in the response to natural disasters and other emergencies; conducting meetings with members of the public; ensuring that the county is effectively represented with respect to federal, state, and other local government agencies; and reviewing issues impacting the county and its residents, businesses, developed and natural environment, and health and safety. The position of supervisor requires supervisors to be responsive to the needs of the public on a 24 hours a day, seven days a week basis."

In addition, according to Hertz, Sutton and

Sanders, the board of supervisors has duties beyond serving in each member's supervisory role, including as voting and participatory members of multiple regional and local governmental adjunct committees, commissions and boards, including the Agua Mansa Industrial Growth Association, the Arrowhead Regional Medical Center Joint Conference Committee, the Behavioral Health Commission, the Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency, the Big Bear Valley Recreation and Park District, the Bloomington Recreation and Park District,

*Continued on Page 4*

## SB County Among Ten Like Jurisdictions With The Highest COVID Numbers *from front page*

South Dakota, Oregon, North Dakota, Montana, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Delaware, Alaska, Wyoming, New Hampshire, Hawaii, Maine and Vermont all have recorded fewer COVID-19 cases than San Bernardino County. As the fifth largest county in California population-wise, San Bernardino County has the highest number of coronavirus cases per capita in all of the state's counties. San Bernardino County has the second highest number of cases among all 58 of the Golden State's counties. Only Los Angeles County, with 10.11 million residents and slight-

ly more than 421,000 confirmed COVID-19 infectees, has more coronavirus cases than San Bernardino County, in terms of sheer numbers. Yet, by comparison of percentages of the population afflicted, San Bernardino County, with 4.545 percent of its 2.2 million residents having contracted the disease, exceeds the 4.164 percent infection rate in Los Angeles County.

The county health department reported 1,629 new coronavirus cases and 21 deaths attributable to the virus today. Of the 100,733 San Bernardino County residents who contracted COVID-19, 1,175 of those have died since February.

At present, there are 904 patients hospitalized with the coronavirus in San Bernardino County hospitals, with 197 of

those in intensive care units.

The number of positive tests in a given area, political subdivision or region does not necessarily reflect the actual seriousness of the pandemic there, as there is a wide disparity of testing rates from one location to another. In San Bernardino County, a little more than one in nine – 11.29 percent – of those who have been tested so far have shown to be infected.

For state officials, the degree to which local hospitals are taxed – or more properly stated, overtaxed – is serving as a measure by which regions and counties are being subjected to more stringent measures to control the pandemic. Yesterday, Governor Gavin Newsom said the state would be putting into effect regional

stay-at-home orders based on the number of hospital beds available to accommodate the cases in which patients are deemed to be critical ill with COVID-19. The greater a county or region's availability of hospital capacity, the less draconian the restrictions imposed in that particular district.

The infection rate in San Bernardino County presages that some very tight restrictions will be applied here in the coming three to four weeks, lasting up to and well into the Christmas holiday. Such measures are imperative, Governor Newsom's office insisted, as a sudden spike in COVID-19 cases that might occur in as little time as one to two days could overwhelm the availability of treatment capacity in the Southland's hospitals.

San Bernardino County has not been able to break out of the most restrictive tier – purple – of the state's four-tier, color-coded reopening plan. Under up-

## In Last Year, Upland Officials Have Demonstrated Pattern Of Approving Major Projects Without Comprehensive Environmental Impact Reports *from front page*

mission to sign off on an assurance that the consequences of the project will not adversely impact the district wherein those projects are to be placed nearby neighborhoods or the city overall, nor overwhelm the infrastructure and utilities serving the area.

In the case of both the Amazon facility, consist-

dated guidelines issued by Governor Newsom toward the end of November, San Bernardino county residents are subject to a 10 p.m. until 5 a.m. curfew.

ing of a 201,096-square-foot warehouse to include 1,486 parking spaces for delivery vans and cars and 25 dock high loading bays for 18-wheeler trucks located on 50 acres north of Foothill Boulevard and south of Cable Airport, and the Villa Serena project, which is to entail a residential subdivision consisting of 65 single family detached residential units on 9.2 acres within a 20.3-acre site at the juncture of 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue within the Foothill Knolls neighborhood, residents banded together and filed suit against the city,

*Continued on Page 5*

## County's Municipal Election Results To Set Tenor Of City Governance Over The Next Four Years *from front page*

Brown with 811 votes or 11.65 percent.

In Barstow's District 3, where a councilmember was chosen, essentially, to replace former Councilman Richard Harpole, who resigned in December 2019 to move to Texas, Barbara Mae Rose, with 1,064 or 38 percent of the 1,716 total votes counted, soundly overcame Leonard Williams, with 652 votes or 38 percent.

In Barstow's District 4, incumbent Councilwoman Carmen Hernandez, who captured 549 votes or 35.88 percent of the 1,530 total votes, was edged by Marilyn Dyer Kruse with 570 votes or 37.25 percent. Martha O'Brien came in third with 411 votes or 26.86 percent.

In Big Bear, Alan Lee, with 291 votes or 61.26 percent of the total votes cast in District 1, bested Maureen Auer, who polled 184 votes or 38.74 percent.

In Big Bear Lake's District 5, incumbent Bob Jackowski, who claimed 165 or 33.81 percent, was convincingly defeated by Bynette Mote, with 323 votes or 66.19 percent.

Longtime Chino Mayor Eunice M. Ulloa, the incumbent, with 26,409 votes or 77.26 percent, whopped Christopher E. Hutchinson, who collected 7,773 votes or 22.74%.

In the Chino City Council District 1 race, newcomer Christopher A. Flores, with 3,521 votes or 54.18 percent, ousted the incumbent, Paul A. Rodriguez, with 2,978 votes or 45.82 percent.

In the Chino City Council District 4 contest, Councilman Tom Haughey did not seek reelection, which allowed former Chino Police Chief Karen C. Comstock to post an easy victory in which she brought in 5,086 votes or 53.87 percent, well above

the totals of Anthony M. Honore, with 1,121 votes or 11.87 percent; Erksine S. Dunson, who captured 1,294 votes or 13.71%; and Brandy Jones, who captured second placed with 1,940 votes or 20.55 percent.

In the Chino Hills City Council race for District 3, incumbent Art Bennett easily outdistanced all challengers as he polled 4,063 votes or 59.6 percent to Sabir Taqi's 689 votes or 10.11 percent; James Gallagher's, 1,665 votes or 24.42%; and Tyler Francis Shields' 400 votes or 5.87 percent.

In Chino Hills' District 5, incumbent Cynthia Moran faced no competition.

In Colton's District 3 and District 6 races, incumbents Kenneth Koperski and Isaac Suchil were unopposed. In District 5, incumbent Jack Woods, with 1,011 votes or 30.12 percent, was turned out of office by John Echevarria, who captured 2,346 votes or 69.88 of the 3,357 total votes cast in the district.

In Fontana, incumbent City Councilman Jesse Armendarez forwent seeking reelection this year, instead vying unsuccessfully to become San Bernardino County Fifth District Supervisor. Incumbent City Councilman Jesse Sandoval, competing in the city's newly created District 2, was retained on the council with 4,241 votes or 30.53 percent of the 13,892 cast in the district, which outran Priscilla Linares's 2,830 votes or 20.37 percent; Sophia Holguin's 3,199 votes or 23.03 percent; Jenique Sanders' 738 votes or 5.31 percent; and Jesse Cerda's 2,884 votes or 20.76 percent.

In Fontana's District 3, Peter Garcia was elected with 8,307 votes or 51.02 percent of the 16,282 votes cast in the district. He thus will replace Armendarez on the council. Finishing behind Garcia were Erick Lopez, with 2,443 votes, or 15 percent; Amy Malone, with 1,750 votes or 10.75 percent; LaShunda Martin, at 1,531 votes or 9.4 percent; Dawn Dooley with 1,029 votes or 6.32%;

and Linda Richardson, with 1,222 votes or 7.51 percent.

In Grand Terrace, 11,943 total votes were cast in a race which saw incumbents Bill Hussey, Sylvia Robles and Jeff Allen reelected, with 2,940 votes or 24.62 percent, 2,570 votes or 21.52 percent and 1,827 votes or 15.3 percent, respectively. Jeremy Briggs, with 1,171 votes or 9.8 percent, Ken Stewart, with 1,678 votes or 14.05 percent; and Jeffrey McConnell, with 1,757 votes or 14.71 percent, captured sixth, fifth and fourth place.

In Hesperia, Rebekah Swanson, elected at large in 2016, stood for election in the city's newly formed District 1 on November 3. She outlasted, with 2,814 votes or 43.56 percent of the 6,460 total votes cast in the district, former City Councilman Mike Leonard, who logged 2,572 votes or 39.81 percent. Running in third was Anthony Rhoades, with 1,074 votes or 16.63 percent.

Larry Bird, also elected at large in 2016 and now serving as the city's appointed mayor, won in a hard fought campaign against Hesperia School Board Member Mark Dundon. Bird had 4,040 votes or 52.2 percent to Dundon's 3,669 votes or 47.8 percent.

In Hesperia's District 4, Brigit Bennington, who ran in a close second place against Jeremiah Brosowske in 2018 and was appointed by the city council to replace him when he was removed as a member of the council in September 2019, ran unopposed in the special race to fill the post for the next two years that was held on November 3.

In the Montclair City Council contest, incumbent Tenice Johnson, with 3,883 votes or 21.98 percent of the 17,665 cast, and Ben Lopez, notching 3,472 votes or 19.65 percent, were elected to four-year terms. Behind them were Michael Tadrous, scoring 2,288 votes or 12.95 percent; Robert E. Pipersky, with 2,589 votes or 14.66%; Juliet Orozco, at 2,518

votes or 14.25%; and Oscar Medina, whose 2,915 votes were 16.5 percent of those counted.

In the polling to determine who would serve the final two years on the term to which former Councilwoman Trish Martinez was elected in November 2018 before her death in September 2019, Martinez's daughter Coryssa, who was appointed to the post by the council, ran unopposed.

In the balloting for two positions on the Ontario City Council, incumbents Debra Porada, with 33,738 votes or 39.09 percent, and Ruben Valencia, with 27,219 votes or 31.54 percent, bested challengers Norberto Corona, with 7,512 votes or 8.7 percent; and Celina Lopez, with 17,837 votes or 20.67 percent.

In Rancho Cucamonga's District 1 city council contest, at-large incumbent Sam Spagnolo, with 9,894 votes or 45.12 percent, outdistanced challengers Jon Hamilton's 7,802 voter endorsements or 35.58 percent and Mark Rush's 4,232 votes or 19.3 percent.

Lynne Kennedy, the incumbent councilwoman competing in this year's Rancho Cucamonga District 4 council race, claimed 11,704 votes or 60.07 percent in burying challengers William James Smith Jr., with 4,140 votes or 21.25 percent, and Roger Wong, who managed to capture 3,641 votes or 18.69 percent.

In Redlands, incumbent councilman Eddie Tejeda ran unopposed in District 2.

In District 4, where incumbent Toni Momberger opted out of seeking reelection, Jenna Guzman-Lowery prevailed, grabbing 2,032 votes or 35.99 percent to Lane Schneider's 1,558 votes or 27.59 percent, Steven Frasher's 1,193 votes or 21.13 percent; and Ivan Ramirez's 863 votes or 15.29 percent.

Rialto Mayor Deborah Robertson was handily reelected with 15,558 votes or 47.12 percent, well ahead of former City Councilman Ed Palmer, who had 7,828 votes or

23.71 percent and Lupe Camacho's 9,631 votes or 29.17 percent.

Incumbent Rialto City Councilmen Andy Carrizales with 12,435 votes or 24.46 percent, and Rafael Trujillo, with 15,560 votes or 30.6 percent, decidedly turned back challenges by Andrew George Karol, with 4,058 votes or 7.98 percent; Stacy Augustine, with 7,450 votes or 14.65 percent; Michael Taylor, with 6,808 votes or 13.39%; and Theresa Schneider, with 4,532 votes or 8.91 percent.

In San Bernardino's Ward 5 election, challenger Ben Reynoso, with 5,772 votes or 52.74 percent, outhustled incumbent Henry Nickel, whose 5,172 votes or 47.26 were not enough to keep him in office. Nickel has indicated he will seek a recount.

In San Bernardino's Ward 7, incumbent Jim Mulvihill, polling 2,874 votes or 34.36 percent,

was decisively defeated by challenger Damon Alexander, whose 5,490 votes accounted for 65.64 percent of those cast.

Nickel and Mulvihill were involved in run-offs last month after they were unable to get a majority of the vote in the election corresponding to the March 3 California Presidential Primary. Also in March, incumbent Third Ward Councilman Juan Figueroa gained reelection while Sixth Ward Councilwoman Bessine Richard was eclipsed by challenger Kimberly Calvin.

In Twentynine Palms District 1, incumbent Councilman Steve Bildrain ran unopposed.

In Twentynine Palms District District 2, challenger Jim Drushat's 492 votes or 47.77 percent was not quite enough to turn incumbent Councilman Joel Klink, who pulled in 538 votes or 52.23 percent, out of office.

In Upland, where incumbent Councilman Bill Velto, a resident of District 1, chose not to seek election to the council but instead run for mayor, the District 1 race was a head-to-head match-up between Shan-

nan Maust, who captured 8,404 votes of 10,002 cast or 84.02 percent to David Hazelton's 1,598 votes, or 15.98 percent.

In the specially-held race to fill the gap in Upland's District 3 following the mid-term resignation of Ricky Felix in May, Carlos Garcia took hold of the office for the next two years with 2,868 votes or 44.59 percent. Lamonta Amos, at 955 votes or 14.85 percent; former Councilman Gino L. Filippi, with 1,126 votes or 17.51 percent; and Tavuga Hoching, with 1,483 votes or 23.06 percent, rounded out the field.

Velto, with 11,821 votes or 32.99 percent, turned incumbent Mayor Debbie Stone, with 9,353 votes or 26.11 percent, out of office. In a relatively close third was Lois Sicking Dieter, with 8,692 votes or 24.26 percent, followed by former Planning Commissioner Alexander Novikov, whom Stone had sacked earlier this year, with 5,961 votes or 16.64 percent.

In Victorville, where incumbent Jim Cox opted out of seeking reelection, 21 hopefuls entered the race for three positions that involved a field that included incumbent appointed Mayor Gloria Garcia, incumbent Councilwoman Blanca Gomez, former Councilmen Eric Negrete and former Mayor/Councilman Ryan McEachron. Ultimately, Elizabeth Becerra, whose name was at the top of the ballot in the Victorville Council race, finished first with 8,690 votes or 9.48 percent. Blanca Gomez captured second, with 8,548 votes or 9.32 percent. Ultimately, the contest for third place and a position on the council for the next four years came down to a dead heat between Leslie Irving, a transplanted politician from Los Angeles County, and McEachron. With the last of the votes counted, Irving prevailed, but by a razor-thin margin, 6,913 votes or 7.54 percent to McEachron's 6,892 votes or 7.52 percent.

*Continued on Page 11*

**Do You Have Information Of Public Interest? Call the *Sentinel* at (951) 567 1936 The *Sentinel* is always looking for information to inform our readership and keep our readers abreast of newsworthy developments.**

**The *Sentinel* devotes itself to what is happening in and around San Bernardino County. Social events, political news, issues pertaining to education, medicine, industry, commerce, development, real estate, history, culture and entertainment are of interest to us.**



# San Bernardino County Sentinel

News of Note  
from Around the  
Largest County  
in the Lower  
48 States

**Let us help you make our readers aware of what is happening in your corner of the world. Do you have a news tip? Don't hesitate to pick up the phone or drop us a line at [sbcsentinel@yahoo.com](mailto:sbcsentinel@yahoo.com) to alert us to that fascinating tidbit.**

## Board Of Supervisors' Lawsuit Maintains It Alone Has The Authority To Set Its Members Pay Grade *from page 2*

the board of supervisors-governed county service areas, the CAL-ID Remote Access Network Board, the California State Association of Counties, the First 5 Children and Families Commission, the Children's Policy Council, the Crafton Hills Open Space Conservancy, the Head Start Shared Governance Board, the High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority, the Indian Gaming Local Benefit Committee, the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority, the In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority, the Inland Counties Emergency Medical Agency, the Inland Empire Economic Partnership, the Inland Empire Health Plan, the Inland Empire Public Facilities Corporation, the Inland Valley Development Agency, the Interagency Council on Homelessness, the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, the Mojave Desert and Mountain Recycling Authority, the Morongo Basin Transit Authority, the Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority, the National Association of Counties, the Ontario International Airport Authority, the Omnitrans Board of Directors, the Quad State Local Governments Authority, the San Bernardino County

Employees' Retirement Association Board of Retirement, the San Bernardino County Financing Authority, the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, the San Bernardino County Flood Control District, the San Bernardino County Industrial Development Authority, the San Bernardino County Law Library Board of Trustees, the San Bernardino County Local Agency Formation Commission, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, the San Bernardino International Airport Authority, the San Bernardino Municipal Water District Advisory Committee on Water Policy, the Santa Ana River Parkway Policy Advisory Group, the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, the Solid Waste Advisory Taskforce, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Southern California Associated Governments, the Southern California Water Coalition, the Successor Agency to the San Bernardino County Redevelopment Agency, the Upper Santa Ana River Washland Management and Habitat Conservation Plan Taskforce, the Urban Counties Caucus, the Victor Valley Economic Development Authority, the Victor Valley Transit Authority and the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority.

Citing the 1976 case of *Meldrim v. Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County* and the 1999 case of *Jahr v. Casebeer, Hertz, Sutton*

and Sanders asserted, "Courts have recognized that [California Constitution] Article XI, Section 1 (b) provides that only county boards of supervisors have the right to set supervisor salaries, and that such salaries may not be set by citizen initiative. Section 4(b) affirms Section 1(b)'s limited grant of power, and both of these sections were amended in the State Constitution in 1970 via Proposition 12, entitled 'Compensation of County Supervisors.' Proposition 12 removed the power to set county supervisors' salaries from the California State Legislature and vested such power in the boards of supervisors. Section 4(b) provides that if a county charter includes a provision that compensation is to be set by legislative action, then only the county's governing body may do so. Section 4(b) does not modify or otherwise affect Section 1(b)'s provision that supervisor compensation may be set only by the county's legislative body. To find otherwise is plainly inconsistent with the Constitution, and is inconsistent with the general scheme of county government."

Just because the county had allowed Measure K onto the ballot and the voters had voted by a margin of more than two-to-one to approve it does not mean that its provisions are binding, Hertz, Sutton and Sanders maintain in the petition.

"Although boards of supervisors are required to place county charter

amendments on the ballot for approval or rejection by the county's voters, such action is distinguishable from measures such as Measure K, which are placed on the ballot via the citizen initiative process, as opposed to the governing body via an ordinance," according to the petition. "Accordingly, Measure K violates California Constitution Article XI, Section 1(b) by seeking to set supervisor compensation via citizen initiative. Measure K must not be implemented because it exceeds the initiative power of the electorate by intruding on matters that are exclusively delegated to the governing body, in this case the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors."

In a letter sent this morning, December 4, to Aaron Burden, a lawyer for the Red Brennan Group, Hertz said, "The petition/complaint is being brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1085, 525 and 1060, et seq., on the grounds that Measure K is unconstitutional, legally invalid, and otherwise unenforceable, and that Ms. Monell, among others, must not take any actions that would cause the implementation of Measure K. We intend to demonstrate to the court, via our ex parte papers, and when the matter is fully briefed and heard on its merits, that Measure K is invalid and unenforceable, that imminent and irreparable harm will occur if Measure K is implemented, and that therefore good cause ex-

ists to warrant the granting of immediate interim relief, and ultimately, preliminary and permanent relief, preventing the implementation of Measure K."

On its face, there were several apparent problems and inconsistencies with the petition for a writ of mandate and the position the board of supervisors is taking in pursuing it.

The board of supervisors' foremost difficulty is that, according to the final certified November 3 election results released this week by the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters Office, Measure K passed with 516,184 or 66.84 percent of the 772,282 voters participating supporting it, and 256,098 voters or 33.16 percent opposed.

Secondly, the Red Brennan Group on March 20, 2020 presented to Registrar of Voters Bob Page petitions endorsed by the signatures of 75,132 county voters which requested what would later be designated as Measure K on the ballot. Page on May 1, 2020 certified the signatures on the Measure K initiative petitions as sufficient. On May 19, 2020, Page presented his certificate of sufficiency to the board of supervisors. The board of supervisors then delayed until June 23, 2020 voting to place Measure K on the November 3, 2020 Presidential General Election ballot, purposefully temporizing while personnel from the county chief executive's office, the county chief operat-

ing officer's staff and the county's in-house stable of attorneys, known as the office of county counsel, researched to determine if there were operational, procedural or legal grounds to justify keeping Measure K off the ballot. County staff was unable to cite adequate grounds for keeping the measure off the ballot.

Thirdly, while the board of supervisors in its petition for a writ of mandate is maintaining that the county's voters do not have the authority to set the board of supervisors' pay rate, on three separate occasions, including as recently as this year, the board of supervisors has placed measures before the voters to have them set the supervisors' pay. In 2006, the board of supervisors, led by then-Second District Supervisor Paul Biane, championed what was ultimately designated as Measure P, which called for raising the supervisors' individual salaries before benefits from \$99,000 per year to \$151,000 per year, while imposing on the supervisors a three-term limit going forward. Measure P passed, and the board of supervisors at no time, including up to the present, sought to block Measure P's implementation.

In 2012, government reform activist Kieran "Red" Brennan, for whom the Red Brennan Group is named, succeeded in gathering sufficient signatures to place what was ultimately des-

*Continued on Page 10*

## Allowing Warehouse Next To Two Residential Projects Latest Of A Series Of Upland Land Use Decisions Triggering Spate Of Lawsuits Against City Hall *from front page*

challenging what they said was the disregard the city had shown for the California Environmental Quality Act and the inadequate conditions imposed on those projects to shield adjoining landowners from the impacts of those developments.

Projections were that with the Amazon warehouse, there would be roughly 50 deliveries made to the facility each day by 18-wheeler trucks bringing merchandise in and approaching 2,000 van or delivery vehicle trips per day with roughly or slightly fewer than 187 trips per hour in the morning rush between 6 a.m. and 10 a.m. and 171 trips per hour in the evening rush between 4 p.m. and 7 p.m.

The Villa Serena project was to be constructed on 9.2 acres within a 20.3-acre site previously committed to serve as a stormwater detention basin, an intrinsic element of an elaborate flood control network serving as a repository for water that during a deluge is channeled away from properties to the north, including the Colonias at San Antonio subdivision, as well as other surrounding properties on the city's northeast side.

The density of the proposed Villa Serena project is roughly 1.75 times the density of the surrounding neighborhood, meaning that within the incoming development, seven houses would be placed onto an acre whereas in the nearby existing portion of the same neighborhood there were roughly four homes per acre. In addition, the height of the two-story homes included in the Villa Serena project created a circumstance in which the mountain vistas of many of the existing homes adjacent to the project are to be partially blocked, cut off or obliterated, and the privacy of those living in the existing residences invaded, as the second story perches of the houses to

be built will allow their occupants in many cases to see right into the existing homes.

In the case of the Bridge Point/Amazon project, which was given approval by the city council with Mayor Debbie Stone, councilmen Bill Velto and Rudy Zuniga and then-Councilman Ricky Felix prevailing and Councilwoman Janice Elliott dissenting, a group of citizens, convinced that the city's planning division including Development Services Director Robert Dalquest had fallen short of protecting the city's residents from the onerous elements and consequences of the project and its impacts, formed a public action committee dubbed Upland Community First. Upland Community First then sued the city, entailing a petition for a writ of mandamus, seeking an injunction against the the Bridge Point project proceeding. The suit sought the voiding of the project's approval, and that the city and applicant be required to complete a comprehensive environmental impact report first if the project is to again be considered. That legal action prevented Bridge Development Partners from moving forward on the project, and as pretrial legal skirmishing between the two parties has been waged, Bridge Development Partners and Amazon failed to achieve the goal of completing a sufficient portion of the distribution center to allow Amazon to carry out a significant percentage of its Southern California delivery operations from the Upland location.

With respect to the Villa Serena project, which was given approval at the April 13 city council meeting, again with Stone, Velto, Zuniga and Felix in support and Elliott in opposition after 22 city residents, most of whom live in the immediate environs of the project, ex-

pressed opposition to the subdivision's approval, another grassroots organization, the Friends of Upland Wetlands formed and is now pursuing a lawsuit against the city relating to its approval of the Villa Serena project, including the filing of a writ of mandamus and a petition for an injunction to halt the project.

Prior to the Yellow Iron Development warehouse project reaching the public hearing stage, there was already a widespread perception among city residents that city staff, in particular its land use and planning specialists, Development Services Director Robert Dalquest foremost among them, were being neglectful of looking after the interests of the city's residents and were allowing project proponents to proceed with developments that were incompatible with the city's zoning and the character of the neighborhoods or sections of the city onto which they were being sited.

As the city planning division – that being the development services division which Dalquest heads – took up the application by Yellow Iron Development to construct a warehouse on 11<sup>th</sup> Street between Central Avenue and Monte Vista Avenue, a cross section of residents already had misgivings that city officials with discretion over the matter would evince greater concern for the developer and for their political masters – the mayor and certain members of the city council who had previously committed to supporting the project – than they had for the residents of the area. When the approval of the project was delegated to the planning commission, an appointed rather than an elected body, the distrust of city officials and Dalquest heightened.

During the November 18 public hearing for the warehouse project, the planning commission as a whole did little to allay that concern, though a two-member minority of that panel – Gary Schwary and Christine Caldwell – gave indica-

tion they were sensitive to the land use incompatibility represented by a warehouse being located within shouting distance of more than 500 homes.

On the meeting agenda for that evening was staff's presentation of the project, including its recommendation that the project be given go-ahead, a public hearing in which city residents and any others could be heard with regard to the issue, a vote which was to include members of the Airport Land Use Committee with regard to a finding that the project is consistent with the Cable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, a vote to make a mitigated negative declaration finding that the project is in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and a vote to approve the development plan for the project.

Entirely foreclosed was the possibility that a comprehensive environmental impact report for the project would be completed. Indeed, during the public hearing, Yellow Iron Development's principal, Tony Spinrad, asserted his initial position that no environmental study of any sort was needed for the project.

"This is not a 50-acre site," Spinrad said. "There are not 1,400 parking spots on here. There are 11 truck positions, and so this isn't going to be thousands of vehicles on the streets. This is going to be what we've studied. It's a relatively small site. It's under five acres. The building is less than a hundred thousand square feet. So initially, we came in and we were hoping to do a CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act] exemption, and [Upland Associate Planner] Joshua Winter, Bob [Dalquest] and the city, they felt it was important to do the studies, and so, I think they've done a great job, and I appreciated working with them this year."

In Spinrad's parlance, the term "studies" meant data assembled for the planning commission to make its mitigated nega-

tive declaration, rather than an actual environmental impact report.

After Upland Land Use Committee Member Ronald Campbell joined with the planning commission in making a finding that the project is consistent with the Cable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the commission moved its focus to whether making a mitigated negative declaration was sufficient to give the project environmental certification.

Two of the commission's members, Gary Schwary and Christine Caldwell, opposed providing the project with a negative declaration. In her comments, Caldwell voiced the view that a warehouse proximate to the existing Harvest subdivision with its 318 dwelling units and the approved-but-yet-to-be-initiated Enclave development, with 192 condominiums and townhomes, was an incompatible use.

It was during his interchange with Spinrad that Schwary locked onto what for many is a very troubling aspect of the warehouse project, that being the lack of definition with regard to the project itself.

"We don't know exactly who our tenant is going to be yet," Spinrad told the planning commission. "We have been talking to [prospective] tenants."

In that respect, the inexactitude of the eventual use has proven disconcerting for more than a smattering of civic activists. The zoning on the property is light industrial, which, according to city officials, would allow the warehouse, once it is completed, to house various types of operations, including manufacturing and a distribution facility, although some city residents dispute the latter, and an incident earlier this year suggests that Dalquest himself and the current city attorney, Steven Flower, are not themselves fully convinced that a distribution facility is allowable under the city's light industrial designation. During the November

18 meeting, Steve Bierbaum, an Upland resident, suggested that the city's light industrial zoning did not square with that of a warehouse facility, from which dozens, scores or even hundreds of vehicles might be dispatched on a daily basis, and to which large trucks, including 18-wheelers, would be making frequent deliveries. Dalquest offered a statement to indicate that the city's light industrial zoning description could be stretched or be interpreted to permit warehouse uses.

At issue is the intensity of use that will take place in the facility once it is built. Based on the city staff report and Spinrad's statements, the eventual use is to relate to some order of a distribution operation rather than a manufacturing one.

A representation made at the November 18 planning commission hearing was that the total vehicle trips into and out of the facility per day would be limited to no more than 250. According to statements made during the course of the meeting, the "equivalent total" of vehicles anticipated at the warehouse is 214 daily, including 130 involving passenger cars and 34 involving trucks, specifically six two-axle trucks, eight three axle trucks and a quantity of 20 four-axle trucks, the last of these presumed to be 18-wheelers. How Spinrad could make that claim without knowing at the present time who the eventual tenant will be was not made clear.

The 214-vehicle/34-truck limitation evolved out of an apparent concern with regard to the facility's proximity to the Harvest and Enclave subdivisions. That proposed limitation was given with the caveat that if the operations at the warehouse could not confine themselves to the 250 vehicle trips per day limit, either Yellow Iron Development or the tenant would be required to return to the planning commission to seek clearance, which

*Continued on Page 9*

Public Notices

**SUMMONS – (FAMILY LAW) NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): SHARON JOY PEDIGO YOU HAVE BEEN SUED.** Read the information below and on the next page. Lo han demandado. Lea la informacion a continuacion y en la pagina siguiente. PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): LAWRENCE ROBERT BOYER, JR. CASE NUMBER 20PFL00848 You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this Summons and Petition are served on you to file a Response (Form FL-120) at the court and have a copy served on the petitioner. A letter or phone call will not protect you. If you do not file your Response on time, the court may make orders affecting your marriage or domestic partnership, your property, and custody of your children. You may be ordered to pay support and attorney fees and costs. For legal advice, contact a lawyer immediately. Get help finding a lawyer at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), at the California Legal Services Website (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), or by contacting your local county bar association. Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de haber recibido la entrega legal de esta Citacion y Peticion para presentar una Respuesta (formulario FL-120) ante la corte y efectuar la entrega legal de una copia al demandante. Una carta o llamada telefonica o una audiencia de la corte no basta para protegerlo. Si no presenta su Respuesta a tiempo, la corte puede dar ordenes que afecten su matrimonio o pareja de hecho, sus bienes y la custodia de sus hijos. La corte tambien le puede ordenar que pague manutencion, y honorarios y costos legales. Para asesoramiento legal, pongase en contacto de inmediato con un abogado. Puede obtener informacion para encontrar un abogado en el Contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en el sitio web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogados de su condado. NOTICE – Restraining orders on page 2: These restraining orders are effective against both spouses or domestic partners until the petition is dismissed, a judgement is entered, or the court makes further orders. They are enforceable anywhere in California by any law enforcement officer who has received or seen a copy of them. AVISO – Las ordenes de restricción se encuentran en la pagina 2 : Las ordenes de restricción estan en vigencia en cuanto a ambos conyuges o miembros de la pareja de hecho hasta que se despida la peticion, se emita un fallo o la corte de otras ordenes. Cualquiera agencia del orden publico que haya recibido o visto una copia de estas ordenes puede hacerlas acatar en cualquier lugar de California. FEE WAIVER : If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the clerk for a fee waiver form. The court may order you to pay back all or part of the fees and costs that the court waived for you or the other party. Exencion de cuotas : Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida al secretario un formulario de exencion de cuotas. La corte puede ordenar que usted pague, ya sea en parte o por completo, las cuotas y costos de la corte previamente exentos a peticion de usted o de la otra parte. FL-100 PETITION FOR Dissolution (Divorce) of: Marriage 1. LEGAL RELATIONSHIP: We are married. 2. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS: a. Petitioner [and] have been residents of this state for at least six months and of this country for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of this petition. (For

Public Notices

divorce, at least one person in the legal relationship described in items 1a and 1c must comply with this requirement.) 3. STATISTICAL FACTS A (1) Date of marriage: March 8, 2003 (2) Date of separation: September 11, 2011 (3) Time from date of marriage to date of separation: 8 years 6 Months 4. MINOR CHILDREN: There are no minor children. 5. LEGAL GROUNDS: Irreconcilable Differences 8. SPOUSAL OR DOMESTIC PARTNER SUPPORT: Terminate (end) the court's ability to ward support to Petitioner [and] Respondent. SEPARATE PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be confirmed by the court. COMMUNITY AND QUASI-COMMUNITY PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be divided by the court. OTHER REQUESTS: Such other and further orders as the court deems just and proper. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y direccion de la corte son): SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 400 Civic Center Plaza Pomona, California 91766 The name, address and telephone number of petitioner's attorney, or petitioner without an attorney, are: (El nombre, direccion y numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante si no tiene abogado, son): LAWRENCE ROBERT BOYER, JR. IN PRO PER 417 S. SHELLMAN AVENUE SAN DIMAS, CALIFORNIA 91773 DATE (Fecha): July 13, 2020 by O Navarro, Deputy (Asistente) for Sherri R. Carter Executive Officer/Clerk of the Court (Secretario) Published in The San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13, 11/20, 11/27 & 12/04, 2020 FBN 20200010183 The following person is doing business as: JOSEPH BRADY, INC. [and] ALLIANCE MANAGEMENT GROUP [and] BARSTOW REAL ESTATE GROUP 240 E WILLIAMS ST BARSTOW, CA 92311 JOSEPH BRADY, INC., 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395 Mailing Address: PO BOX 2710 VICTORVILLE, CA 92393-2710 This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. S/ JOSEPH W. BRADY This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: DECEMBER 4, 1989 County Clerk, Deputy A9730 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20 & 12/04/20. NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER THE ESTATE OF: FRANK MANUEL CARLIN NO. PROPS20000857 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of FRANK MANUEL CARLIN A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by FRANCES NORIEGA in the Superior

Public Notices

Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that FRANCES NORIEGA be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S37 at 8:30 a.m. on December 17, 2020 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX 1894 COMMERCE CENTER W. SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 909 890 2350 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20, 11/27 & 12/4, 2020. FBN 20200010182 The following person is doing business as: JOSEPH BRADY, INC. [and] THE BRADCO COMPANIES [and] BRADCO HIGH DESERT REPORT [and] THE SHOPS AT SPANISH TRAIL [and] THE SHOPPES AT SPANISH TRAIL [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY REAL ESTATE GROUP [and] BRADCO COMMERCIAL LEASING GROUP [and] BRADCO DEVELOPMENT [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE [and] BRADCO MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE [and] HIGH DESERT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL [and] MOJAVE RIVER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT [and] MOJAVE RIVER ECONOMIC GROUP [and] HIGH DESERT VALLEY SURVEY (which began transacting business 08/01/2019) [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY SURVEY (for which no date for commencing service is provided) 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395 JOSEPH BRADY, INC., 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395 Mailing Address: PO BOX 2710

Public Notices

VICTORVILLE, CA 92393-2710 This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. S/ JOSEPH W. BRADY This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: DECEMBER 4, 1989 County Clerk, Deputy A9730 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20 & 12/04/20. FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- 20200010303 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Talamanca's Products, 203 E Park St, Ontario, CALIF, 91761, Javier Castillo, 203 E Park St, Ontario, CALIF 91761 Business is Conducted By: An Individual Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. S/ Javier Castillo This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/05/20 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20, 12/04/20 FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- 20200010078 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: KA Brand Shop Online USA, 7360 GUTHRIE ST, San Bernardino, CA 92410, Kimath Im, 7360 GUTHRIE ST, San Bernardino, CA 92410 Business is Conducted By: An Individual Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. S/ Kimath Im This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/20 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 10/22/20 County Clerk, s/ E4004 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20, 12/04/20 FBN 20200009414 The following person is doing business as: DUARTE'S MITIGATION 777 S. TEMESCAL ST. SPC. 13 CORONA, CA 92879; VANESSA DUARTE 777 S. TEMESCAL ST. SPC. 13 CORONA, CA 92879 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all

Public Notices

information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VANESSA DUARTE, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/2020 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB412020071R FBN 20200010079 The following person is doing business as: BEAUTEYBVEE 829 W FOOTHILL BLVD, SUITE B UPLAND, CA 91786-[ MAILING ADDRESS 1155 SOUTH RIVERSIDE AVENUE, SPACE 97 RIALTO, CA 92376; VIANDA C LOPEZ 1155 SOUTH RIVERSIDE AVE SPACE 97 RIALTO, CA 92376 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/VIANDA C LOPEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/2020 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202001MT NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BARBARA GILL HOOPER CASE NO. PROPS 2000831 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BARBARA GILL HOOPER A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by LINDA DENSMORE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that LINDA DENSMORE be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held DECEMBER 17, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S-35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the grant-

Public Notices

ing of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: NOVEMBER 3, 2020 Attorney for the Petitioner: JENNIFER DANIEL The Law Offices of Jennifer Daniel, APC 220 Nordina Street Redlands, CA 92373 Telephone No: (909) 792-9244 Fax: No: (909) 235-4733 team@lawofficeofjenniferdaniel.com Attorney for Linda Densmore Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/06, 11/13 & 11/20, 2020 FBN 20200009878 The following person is doing business as: F&V MOBILE FIBERGLASS REPAIR 53161 TWENTYNINE PALMS HIGHWAY MORONGO VALLEY, CA 92256; FRANCISCO VALENZUELA 53161 TWENTYNINE PALMS HIGHWAY MORONGO VALLEY, CA 92256 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ FRANCISCO VALENZUELA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/23/2020 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202002MT FBN 20200009876 The following person is doing business as: BIG WEST TOWING AND RECOVERY INC. 17316 EL MOLINO ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316; BIG WEST TOWING AND RECOVERY INC. 17316 EL MOLINO ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ALEJANDRO J. AVINA, C.E.O.

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/23/2020 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202003MT FBN 20200009789 The following person is doing business as: GARCIA'S TRENCH LESS SOLUTIONS 4265 N F ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; VICTOR H GARCIA ESPINOZA 4265 N F ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; HUMBERTO GARCIA FLORES JR 4265 N F ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 9407 The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VICTOR H. GARCIA ESPINOZA, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/21/2020 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202004MT FBN 20200010134 The following person is doing business as: CW & CM TRUCKING LLC 24853 6TH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX 3208 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92413; CW & CM TRUCKING LLC 24853 6TH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MARGIA F. CASTELON, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: N/A I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202006MT FBN 20200010113 The following person is doing business as: TWIST CUTZ 191 N PLYMOUTH WAY SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408; ANTHONY D LOWE 191 N PLYMOUTH WAY SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record

Public Notices

upon filing.  
s/ ANTHONY D. LOWE, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy  
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202007MT

FBN 20200010466

The following person is doing business as: VM TRUCKING 551 E RIVERSIDE DR. APT. 44 ONTARIO, CA 91761; VALENTIN HERRERA BALTAZAR 551 E RIVERSIDE DR. APT. 44 ONTARIO, CA 91761  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ VALENTIN HERRERA BALTAZAR, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/04/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB462020081F

FBN 20200010479

The following person is doing business as: LAKE ARROWHEAD VILLAGE DENTAL GROUP 28200 HIWAY 189 SUITE 01-250 LAKE ARROWHEAD, CA 92352; MAILING ADDRESS 292 E 40TH STREET, SUITE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404; ASH M DASON, DDS, A PROFESSIONAL DENTAL CORPORATION 292 E 40TH STREET, SUITE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404  
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 06/30/2020

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ASH MOSES DASON, PRESIDENT  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/13/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202009MT

FBN 20200010222

The following person is doing business as: L&E MOBILE SERVICES 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC #118 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; ENGLELE I ULLOA MARTINEZ 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC #118 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who de-

Public Notices

clares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ENGLELE I. ULLOA MARTINEZ, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/03/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy  
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202010MT

FBN 20200010219

The following person is doing business as: TOP RANK TURF 22597 BARTON RD SUITE D GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313; MAILING ADDRESS 1111 VALLEY SPRING LANE COLTON, CA 92324; TOP RANK BUILDING MATERIALS INC 22597 BARTON RD SUITE A GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313  
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ABIE GARCIA JR, PRESIDENT  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/03/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202011MT

FBN 20200009803

STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

The following person is doing business as: CASILLAS TRANSPORT 1057 1/2 W 7TH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411; DAVID CASILLAS 1057 1/2 W 7TH ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92411  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino County on 03/12/2018. Original File#FBN20180002838

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ DAVID CASILLAS, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/21/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202012MT

FBN 20200010403

The following person is doing business as: AXLE'S MACHINE SHOP 10803 FREMONT AVE STE A&B ONTARIO, CA 91761; PORTABLE SPINDLE REPAIR SPECIALIST, INC. 10803 FREMONT AVE STE A&B ONTARIO, CA 91761  
The business is conducted by: A

Public Notices

CORPORATION  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ MARK A. TWOGOOD, PRESIDENT  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/10/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202013MT

FBN 20200010312

The following person is doing business as: LUCIAN'S PIZZA 33946 YUCAIPA BLVD STE B YUCAIPA, CA 92399; MAYALACOB LLC 33946 YUCAIPA BLVD STE B YUCAIPA, CA 92399  
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ CARLOS I. HERRERA, MANAGING MEMBER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/05/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202014MT

FBN 20200010402

The following person is doing business as: FLOYD TAXI SERVICES 43033 HAMPTON DRIVE NEWBERRY SPRINGS, CA 92365; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX #99 NEWBERRY SPRINGS, CA 92365; FLOYD G MISASA 43033 HAMPTON DRIVE NEWBERRY SPRINGS, CA 92365  
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ FLOYD G. MISASA, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/10/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/20/2020, 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 CNBB46202015MT

FBN 20200010162

The following person is doing business as: EQUITY LG 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 ROMY CHAVES 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 [and] LUCAS F BARRIOS 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO

Public Notices

HILLS, CA 91709  
The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ROMMY CHAVES  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/29/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 & 12/18/2020

FBN 20200010198

The following person is doing business as: SHORELINE MG 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 ROMY CHAVES 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 [and] LUCAS F BARRIOS 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709  
The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ROMMY CHAVES  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 & 12/18/2020

FBN 20200010191

The following person is doing business as: BRIDGEPOINT PG 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 ROMY CHAVES 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 [and] LUCAS F BARRIOS 5861 PINE AVE SUITE A-5 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709  
The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ROMMY CHAVES  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 & 12/18/2020

FBN 20200010102

The following person is doing business as: FONTANA SMOG CHECK TEST ONLY 8171 SIERRA AVE UNIT R FONTANA, CA 92335 S MARTINEZ LLC A CA

Public Notices

CORPORATION 202028310330  
8171 SIERRA AVE UNIT R FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ SERGIO MARTINEZ  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/27/2020, 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020 & 12/18/2020

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF VIOLET MARION PERRY CASE NO. PROPS2000896

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and contingent creditors of VIOLET MARION PERRY, and persons who may be otherwise interested in the will or estate, or both: A petition has been filed by JOHN DAVID PERRY in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO, requesting that JOHN DAVID PERRY be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of VIOLET MARION PERRY.

(The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. This will avoid the need to obtain court approval for many actions taken in connection with the estate. However, before taking certain actions, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or have consented to the proposed action. The petition will be granted unless good cause is shown why it should not be.)

The petition is set for hearing in Dept. No. S36 at SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT - PROBATE DIVISION 247 W. 3rd STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0212 on December 30, 2020 at 09:00 AM

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the deceased, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 58 of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery of the notice to you under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Section 1250 of the California Probate Code.

The Attorney for Petitioner JOHN DAVID PERRY is: LAUREN FYFE SB 292606  
FYFE LAW FIRM 13250 KIRKHAM WAY SUITE 109 POWAY, CA 92064  
Telephone: 858-412-7714  
Lauren@FyfeLaw.com

Public Notices

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/04, 12/11 & 12/18, 2020

FBN 20200009949

The following person is doing business as: HOMETOWN REALTY 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92340 ROSEMARIE LABADIE 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92325  
Mailing Address: PO BOX 3046 CRESTLINE, CA 92325

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL  
BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ Rosemarie Labadie  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/27/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: OCTOBER 21, 2020  
County Clerk, Deputy I327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20 & 11/20/20. Corrected on 12/4, 12/11, 12/18 & 12/25.

FBN 20200010512

The following entity is doing business as: GAMESTOP 917 12602 AMARGOSA AVENUE, SUITE B VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; GAMESTOP, INC 625 WESTPORT PARKWAY GRAPEVINE, TEXAS 76051 State of Incorporation: MN Reg. No.: 1969245  
Mailing Address: 625 WESTPORT PARKWAY GRAPEVINE, TX 76051

This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION  
BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ GEORGE E. SHERMAN  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/16/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: JULY 18, 2000  
County Clerk, Deputy E4004

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/04, 12/11, 12/18 & 12/25, 2020

FBN 20200010514

The following entity is doing business as: GAMESTOP 1183 14400 BEAR VALLEY ROAD SUITE 225 VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; GAMESTOP, INC 625 WESTPORT PARKWAY GRAPEVINE, TEXAS 76051 State of Incorporation: MN Reg. No.: 1969245  
Mailing Address: 625 WESTPORT PARKWAY GRAPEVINE, TX 76051

This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION  
BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ GEORGE E. SHERMAN  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/16/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: JUNE 5, 1996  
County Clerk, Deputy E4004

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/04, 12/11, 12/18 & 12/25, 2020

FBN 20200010518

The following entity is doing business as: GAMESTOP 2662 27512 LUGONIA AVENUE, SUITE B2F REDLANDS, CA 92374; GAMESTOP, INC 625 WESTPORT PARKWAY



Public Notices

statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202005CH

FBN 20200010687

The following person is doing business as: 7-NEW CARRILLO MARKET 635 E. HOLT BLVD. UNIT A ONTARIO, CA 91761; MAILING ADDRESS 12839 12TH ST. APT 3 CHINO, CA 91710; PARBATI SAUD THAPA 635 E. HOLT BLVD. UNIT A ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also

Public Notices

aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ PARBATI SAUD THAPA, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/20/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202006IR

FBN 20200010751

The following person is doing business as: STERLING MINI MART 2352 STERLING AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404; MAILING ADDRESS 2185 W. COLLEGE AVE. APT 3065 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; RIGOBERTO AVILA MURRIETA 2352 STER-

Public Notices

LING AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ RIGOBERTO AVILA MURRIETA, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/23/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Public Notices

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202007MT

FBN 20200010656

The following person is doing business as: FONTANA SUSPENSION AND AUTO REPAIR 17890 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335-8537; MAILING ADDRESS 1150 N MULBERRY AVE RIALTO, CA 92376; OMAR RAMIREZ 17890 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335-8537

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ OMAR RAMIREZ, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/19/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Public Notices

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202008MT

FBN 20200010775

The following person is doing business as: CAP'SOULS BY GIGI BOOKS 1483 E LYNWOOD RD APT #12 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404; JUSTIN O BAYNE 1483 E LYNWOOD RD APT #12 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this

Public Notices

statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ JUSTIN O. BAYNE, OWNER  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/23/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202009MT

FBN 20200010661

The following person is doing business as: LUNA'S PET SPAW 26914 CA-189 BLUE JAY, CA 92317; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX 52 TWIN PEAKS, CA 92391; TELIA B SECHRIST 26914 CA-189 BLUE JAY, CA 92317; RYAN S SECHRIST 26914 CA-189 BLUE JAY, CA 92317

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE

Public Notices

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ TELIA B. SECHRIST, WIFE  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/19/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/04/2020, 12/11/2020, 12/18/2020, 12/25/2020 CNBB48202010MT

Warehouse Proponent Says He Has No Tenant Lined Up from page 5

might not necessarily be granted, to increase that truck activity. This immediately struck many of those in attendance as implausible, and a manipulation of the approval process that was intended to allow a far more onerous degree of activity that would be incompatible with the project's surroundings than was being openly acknowledged at the meeting. The developer was seeking approval of a project in which the exact nature of the operation and the precise or even approximate number of vehicles it would entail was unknown.

An analysis of known and indefinite factors relating to the project and the property upon which it is proposed to stand indicates that the eventual tenant will be called upon to spend roughly \$92,000 in basic rent per month or \$1.1 million per year to occupy the proposed building, based upon a \$1 per square foot per month rental cost, which falls within the average rate in Southern California. Leasing would only be a percentage of a warehouse's operating costs. In addition, other cost elements to open the doors of a warehouse or distribution facility and make it operational would be involved, including but not limited to

the provision of utilities, purchase of and debt service for the acquisition of equipment, vehicles and furnishings, plant maintenance, insurance, taxes and personnel. These combined costs could zoom to as much as \$500,000 per month. In order to meet this financial burden, an energetic and intensive warehouse operation will be required, entailing trucks flowing in and out all day long, perhaps in three shifts per day. Yet, based upon what was said at the November 18 meeting, the eventual tenant will be prevented, from the outstart, from operating more than a very small number of trucks, including those engaged in bringing merchandise into the warehouse and then vehicles loaded with merchandise being dispatched from the warehouse for either wholesale or retail delivery. This limitation would seem to reduce considerably the number of entities that would be willing to locate on the property, since the ability to generate sufficient income as a going concern involved in warehousing and delivery would likewise be diminished, perhaps to below that which would be profitable.

That consideration has led some in the community to conclude that Yellow Iron Development and Spinrad were purposefully under-representing the intensity of the future use of the property in an effort to

obtain an entitlement for Yellow Iron Development to proceed. The perception is that Dalquest is far too sophisticated to not understand or have missed that reality, and that he and city staff were knowingly going along with the misrepresentation as to the intensity of use at the proposed warehouse, knowing that once operations were at full swing there, vehicle trips into and out of the facility will approach or exceed a thousand per day.

Among those addressing the planning commission on November 18 with regard to the Yellow Iron warehouse proposal was Carlos Garcia, who was elected earlier this month to fill the vacant position on the city council representing Upland's Third District, in which the Yellow Iron Development warehouse project and the Harvest and Enclave subdivisions are located.

Speaking as an Upland resident rather than in his role as councilman-elect, Garcia said, "This does affect our community," pointing out that the Harvest subdivision is nearing full completion with residents already living there, and the Enclave project will soon be under way. Garcia, who will be sworn into office on December 14 and complete the term of former Councilman Ricky Felix who resigned in May to move to Utah, expressed the view that the warehouse as proposed

does not fit the light industrial business park description contained in the city's zoning code and, as such, is an incompatible use adjacent to a residential neighborhood. He said the truck traffic the warehouse will generate will prove problematic. "There is one way in and one way out," Garcia said, noting, "We have already seen 18 wheelers on 11<sup>th</sup> Street." The addition of the warehouse will exacerbate that problem, he said. He further alluded to the mystery relating to who will actually occupy the warehouse once it is built, saying Yellow Iron Development was "creating a project there, but do we have a tenant? There is nothing solid or concrete. There is nothing to tell us what is actually moving in there, so we can know the impact."

Subtly, and without being confrontational about it, Planning Commissioner Schwary alluded to the disconnect between what Spinrad was saying he was proposing and how the project would eventually prove out once it was built. In this respect, Dalquest appeared to be providing Yellow Iron a certain degree of wiggle room by saying that if it turned out in the future that the eventual tenant needed to utilize the property with a greater degree of intensity than was being conceded that evening, the tenant would be obliged to return to the planning

commission to seek permission to intensify the use.

Schwary dryly stated that such under-representations had been made to the planning commission in the past. "We've kind of had a crash course on this recently," Schwary said. He then gave indication that there was, for him, too much vagary in what Spinrad and Yellow Iron were offering, which the eventual tenant at the warehouse would be able to drive, literally, scores or even hundreds of Mack trucks through on a daily basis.

"I think that what needs to be done is to give a clearer, more definitive number for the residents on how many trucks are going to come in," Schwary said.

Politely, Schwary referenced the somewhat absurd suggestion Spinrad had made in seeking to minimize the intensity of use at the 92,275-square foot warehouse building by referring to it as a "mom and pop" operation, obliquely indicating his skepticism.

"I understand when you don't have a tenant you don't know that, but then I hear mom and pop," Schwary said. "We need to go beyond that."

Schwary reacted to Spinrad's statement that he would be able to get the eventual tenant to erect signs near or at the exit from the warehouse property instructing truck drivers not to transit through the nearby

residential neighborhoods or the streets adjacent to them.

"You can put ups signs all you want, but we know that truck drivers will just want to get to where they go quickly," he said. Schwary then asked of the city's legal counsel, "Can we fine the tenant if these trucks don't go the route?" That did not provoke a definitive response. Schwary then said, "There is no need for any residents to have trucks go through their neighborhood. I want to see a limit on the amount of trucks, but we can't do that until we know what kind of tenant you have. You might not know what kind of tenant you have until you have it built, so it's a chicken or the egg theory."

Though the commission did sign off on the mitigated negative declaration for the project, with Commissioners Robin Aspinall, Carolyn Anderson, Thomas Grahn, Serge Mayer and Patrick Shim outvoting Scwary and Caldwell on that issue, the actual decision to allow Yellow Iron to proceed was postponed until the December 9 planning commission meeting, at which time Spinrad is supposed to provide firmer numbers with regard to the truck traffic and other particulars with regard to the warehouse's anticipated eventual use so conditions can be layered into the

## Supervisors' Suit Against Measure K Takes Issue With The Same Elements They Put Into Their Own Measures P, Q & J from page 4

ignated as Measure R on that year's November ballot, an initiative that was identical to Measure K in its remuneration limitation aspect with regard to the supervisors' pay level, reducing what was then each supervisor's total annual \$219,471 compensation, which at that time consisted of \$151,971 yearly salaries and \$67,500 in benefits, to \$60,000, composed of \$50,000 in salary and \$10,000 in benefits annually. In reaction to Measure R, the members of the board of supervisors, alarmed at the prospect that they would be subject to seeing their pay reduced by more than two-thirds but simultaneously recognizing that the public's appetite for reform was intense, used their authority as government officials to place an alternative measure on that year's ballot, what was ultimately designated as Measure Q. Measure Q called for leaving the supervisors' then-\$151,971 yearly salaries in place, while reducing their annual benefits from \$67,500 to \$63,500, thus dropping their total annual compensation to \$214,471.

Both Measure Q and Measure R passed, Measure R by a convincing 64.25 percent to 35.75 percent, with 326,939 voters in favor of it and 181,907 opposed. Measure Q achieved passage by a 67.28 percent to 32.72 percent margin, 344,226 votes in support to 157,369 against it. Because Measure Q garnered more votes than Measure R, the former went into effect rather than the latter. Instead of the supervisors seeing their \$219,471 per year total compensation packages reduced to \$60,000, they were instead cut back to \$214,202. The board of supervisors at no point, including up to the present time, objected to or sought to interfere with the provisions of Measure Q.

This year, after the Red Brennan Group succeeded in qualifying what was subsequently designated as Measure K for the November 3 ballot, the board of supervisors sought to replicate the success it had in 2012 by again putting onto the ballot a substitute measure that dealt with the issue of the supervisors' pay grade. At its July 14, 2020 meeting, the board of supervisors voted to place on the November 3 ballot what its members referred to as a charter reform measure, one which was ultimately designated as Measure J. Though there had been scant discussion of charter changes previously and no expression of a public consensus on what elements of the charter should be redressed, the office of county counsel virtually overnight delivered the language for the charter reform initiative, which included what board members claimed was the important reform of modernizing the charter's language to eliminate what is now considered outdated and genderist references, such as the charter's reference to the board's designated leader as "chairman" and what "his" duties consist of. Further, since the current charter did not directly address the compensation the supervisors receive, their level of pay was deemed an important issue for the redraft. Without any previous discussion of an appropriate remuneration level, the office of county counsel, working from the premise that the supervisors' current average annual salary of \$163,000, further/add-on pay of roughly \$17,000 and benefits of \$77,000 for a total annual compensation of \$257,000 is what the supervisors deserve, hit upon setting the supervisors' salaries at 80 percent of the salary of a Superior Court judge and giving them benefits equal to county

department heads. Thus, Measure J called for setting the supervisors total annual compensation at somewhere in the range of \$257,000 to \$287,000, depending upon the amount of further/add-on pay or familial health coverage benefits they are provided with. Measure J also spelled out that the three-term limitation imposed on the supervisors by Measure P meant that a supervisor could not serve as supervisor for three years in one district and then move to another district where he or she would be eligible to serve three more terms representing that district. In this way, Measure J reduced the total number of terms an individual might conceivably serve on the board from a maximum of 15 to three.

According to the final certified election results released by the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters, Measure J passed, with 378,964 votes or 50.72 percent of the 747,188 votes cast supporting it and 368,224 or 49.28 percent opposed. In 2012, Measure Q, which had been placed on the ballot by the supervisors to thwart the drastic reduction in their salaries embodied in Red Brennan's Measure R, received the greater number of votes and thus went into effect. This year, Measure J, which would have kept the supervisors' generous salaries intact, received fewer votes than Measure K. Thus, according to the practice of resolving a conflict between the provisions of two measures simultaneously adopted by the voters by implementing the provisions of the winning measure that gets the most votes and disregarding the conflicting provisions of a winning measure that gets fewer votes, the board of supervisors is to see its members' total annual compensation reduced to \$60,000 going forward. In placing measures before the county's voters, the board of supervisors has not hesitated in giving those voters an opportunity to set the pay

grade for themselves in their capacity as county supervisors.

Fourthly, the contention by Hertz, Sutton and Sanders that Measure K violates the single subject limitation on measures runs head-on into the consideration that the county has on numerous occasions, as with 2006's Measure P and this year's Measure J, placed measures on the ballot that were in violation of the single subject limitation for measures. Measure P had multiple provisions, including raising the supervisors' pay level and subjecting the supervisors to a limitation on the number of terms they can serve. The board of supervisors at no point, up to the present, contested the applicability or implementation of Measure P because it violated the single subject limitation.

Fifthly, Hertz, Sutton and Sanders maintain in their petition for a writ of mandate that Measure K violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution by putting into place a lifetime term limit provision for members of the county board of supervisors, even though both Measure P, placed on the ballot by the board of supervisors in 2006 and passed by the voters, and Measure J, placed on the ballot by the board of supervisors this year and passed by the voters, impose a lifetime term limit provision on the board of supervisors.

In these ways, to some it seemed that the filing of the petition for a writ of mandate was aimed less at the somewhat unrealistic goal of preventing Measure K from ever going into effect than it was being used to ensure that the provisions do not take immediate effect. There is law and precedent to establish that a measure that is applicable to elected officials only pertains to office holders elected after such a measure is passed. For example, the current dean of the board of supervisors is Josie Gonzales, who was first elected to the board in

2004. In 2006 Measure P, limiting supervisors to three terms in office, was passed by the county's voters. Yet, Gonzales, at the conclusion of her first term, successfully ran for reelection in 2008, ran again in 2012 and ran once more in 2016. Gonzales's tenure in office has now run to four terms. Her first term on the board, from 2004 to 2008, was not subject to Measure P, while from 2006 onward, she was subject to Measure P. In this way, the terms she was elected to in 2008, 2012 and 2016 represent the three terms she was entitled to hold, pursuant to voter approval, under Measure P.

By way of further illustration, Second District Supervisor Janice Rutherford, who was first elected in 2010 and reelected in 2014 and 2018, will be termed out in 2022 under the term limitation provision of Measure P. Since she was reelected in 2018 under the terms of Measure P, she is entitled, by most interpretations, to finish her current term and to receive the remuneration that was in place at the time she was reelected in 2018, meaning she is eligible, until leaving office, to receive her current total annual compensation of \$265,738.17, which includes \$166,150.75 in salary, \$17,000.10 in other pay add-ons and benefits of \$82,587.32. One interpretation of the term limitation provision of Measure K, however, is that Measure P has now been superseded, and Rutherford is no longer bound by Measure P. So, by one interpretation, Measure K has yet to apply to her, making her eligible to seek reelection in 2022 once more, though if she is successful she would have to take a cut from her current \$265,738.17 in total annual compensation to \$60,000.

Curt Hagman, who was first elected in 2014, reelected in 2018 and is currently receiving \$254,373.11 in annual total compensation, including \$160,746.94 in salary, \$17,000.10 in add-on pay and \$76,626.07 in benefits, is entitled,

under the provisions of Measure P, to continue to receive \$254,373.11 in annual total compensation for the remainder of this year, for 2021 and for most of 2022 until the current term to which he was elected in 2018 comes to an end in December of that year. Under Measure P and Measure K, Hagman can seek reelection in 2022. Under Measure K, if Hagman in fact runs for reelection in 2022 and is successful, upon his term commencing that December, he will have to take a salary cut to \$50,000 annually and a benefit reduction to \$10,000. Under both Measure P and Measure K, he will be termed out in 2026.

Dawn Rowe, who has been on the board of supervisors in an appointed capacity since 2018, along with Congressman Paul Cook and Rialto City Councilman Joe Baca, were all elected this year under the terms of Measure P, meaning each is entitled to a total annual compensation of around \$240,000, consisting of a salary of \$160,000, add-on pay of \$15,000 to \$20,000 and benefits ranging from \$60,000 to \$65,000 for the next four years. Beginning in 2024, each would then be subject to the provisions of Measure J, meaning they could seek reelection at that point but would be subject, if victorious, to seeing their salaries slashed to \$50,000 annually and their benefits reduced to \$19,000. If they indeed chose to run in 2024 and remained in office by being reelected, they would need to leave the board in 2028 as a consequence of the one-term limit under Measure K.

If the board of supervisors proves successful in its suit against its own clerk of the board, none of the Measure K limitations will apply.

"Measure K has been approved by more than two-thirds of San Bernardino County voters," Red Brennan Group spokeswoman Natalie

*Continued on Page 11*

## Environmentalists Sue Over Expansion Of Church In The Forest *from page 10*

ters area raises serious water quality concerns. The county also ignored independent experts' warnings that the project would create traffic hazards and add to wildfire evacuation problems."

Steven Farrell of the Mountain Group Sierra Club said, "We appreciate the church's efforts in support of our community, but not with this project at this location. It is too disruptive. The county is violating the law by accepting this proposal's flawed envi-

ronmental impact report and making an unsupported, inadequate statement of overriding consideration. Even with its significant shortcomings, the environmental impact report identifies severe impacts to the public and to the site that the planning commission has misleadingly declared to be of no consequence."

"We support the Church of the Woods congregation in their desire for a larger facility, but cannot allow the county to ignore the laws and policies designed to protect public safety, quality of life, our unique forest environment and imperiled plants and ani-

mals," said Peter Jorris of the Audubon Society. "The County of San Bernardino needs to follow its own guidelines more faithfully and to accurately assess the full impacts of this project to avoid permanent harm to our community, visitors, the forest and its wildlife."

On January 23, 2020, the San Bernardino County Planning Commission considered the project. At the hearing, 37 members of the public expressed their concerns about the project and asked that it be denied, while 26 members of the public expressed support for the project and asked that it be ap-

proved. County planning staff made a recommendation for approval of the project. After the planning commission concurred with the staff recommendation, and memorialized that in a vote to allow the project to proceed, the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, and the Save Our Forest Association appealed the approval to the county board of supervisors. The board voted on October 20, 2020, to deny the appeal and grant final approval for the project.

As proposed and approved, the undertaking will involve a 27,364-square foot, two-story youth center/gymnasium, recreational fa-

cilities, a 41,037-square foot, two-story assembly building with a maximum seating capacity of 600, and a 1,500-square foot, two-story maintenance/caretaker unit in two phases on a 13.6-acre portion of the church's 27.12-acre site.

According to Patrick Hopkins, a member of the Church of the Woods congregation and a licensed contractor who is serving as the project manager, the church has addressed water quality concerns relating to the project by complying with the conditions imposed on it in the county's permitting process. He said the improvements, to be known

as Sunrise in the Woods, will not impinge on the wildlife corridor adjoining the 27-acres where the development will take place. The church is intent on proceeding with the project, having already spent in the neighborhood of \$1 million to plan the project and obtain permits and an entitlement to build, Hopkins said. He said the environmentalists opposing the project are intruding on the church's property rights. He insisted the church has complied with the California Environmental Quality Act in pursuing the project.

-Mark Gutglueck

## Countywide Municipal November 3 Election Results Released *from page 10*

Garcia finished in ninth, with 5,338 votes or 5.82 percent. Negrete came up way short, running in thirteenth place, with 3,271 votes or 3.57 percent. Others in the race were Bob Bowen, Kareema Abdul, Lizet Angulo,

Webster Thomas, Craig Timchak, Roger LaPlante, Jerry Laws, Valentin Godina, Mike Stevens, Terrance Stone, Ashiko Newman, Paul Marsh, Kimberly Mesen, Lionel Dew, Adam Verduzco, Jr., and Frank Kelly

Yucaipa City Councilman Bobby Duncan, running in the city's newly-formed District 3, was granted another four years on the council with 2,512 votes or 64.08 percent. Clifford Gericke

ran in third with 405 votes or 10.33 percent, and Lee Kaberlein ran in second, with 1,003 votes or 25.59.

After incumbent Councilwoman Denise Hoyt Allen opted out of seeking reelection, the Yucaipa City Council District 4 race involved Justin Beaver, who won with 3,038 votes or 62.47 percent, running against Stacey Chester, who fell short with 1,825 votes or 37.53 percent.

The Yucaipa City Council, District 5 race was notable this year because challenger Jon Thorp, polling 2,394 votes or 42.42 percent, ousted Councilman Dick Riddell, one of the longest serving elected officials in San Bernardino County, who claimed 2,129 votes or 37.73 percent. Patricia Elbeck, with 430 votes or 7.62 percent, and Craig Suvog, with 690 votes or 12.23 percent, also com-

peted.

In Yucca Valley, Jeff Drozd, who currently holds the distinction of serving as mayor based upon his having been rotated into that position by appointment as the result of a vote of his council colleagues, was locked in a relatively close contest against challenger David Simmons in the town's District 2 race. Drozd, with 832 votes or 54.24 percent, outlasted Simmons, who finished

with a respectable 702 votes or 45.76 percent.

In the town's District 4 race, incumbent Robert Lombardo captured 669 votes or 36.83 percent to hold off Jeff Brady, who had an impressive showing of support with 592 votes or 31.71 percent. Travis Puglisi ran in third with 380 votes or 20.35 percent, and Myra Kennedy collected 226 votes or 12.1 percent.

-Mark Gutglueck

## Supervisors Suing Their Own Clerk To Prevent Pay Cuts Mandated By Two-Thirds Of The County's Voters Is A Blatantly Arrogant Self-Serving Effort To Preserve Their Quarter Of A Million Dollar Annual Compensation, Government Reformer Says *from page 10*

Zuk told the *Sentinel*. "Regardless, the San Bernardino County Supervisors, in an act of naked self-interest, are suing to keep the successful measure from going into effect. The measure, proposed by a local small business owner and sponsored by The Red Brennan Group, deals a blow to the concept of the 'career politician.' San Bernardino County voters have spoken clearly and in no uncertain terms. Citizens want to be represented by peers rather than a political elite. Local voters no longer support elected officials dedicated to protecting their own self-interests at the expense of their

constituents. The incentives associated with the current model are amiss. Legislators are attracted to lucrative pay, pension benefits and perks that come with elected office. The result is the people's representatives are at the whim of political party dynamics, special interest groups, corporations, and private individuals as they scrape to keep their hold on the power and perks of office. Measure K was designed specifically to overhaul the incentives to serve as a county supervisor. Rather than a quarter-million-dollar a year pay and benefit package, Measure K allows for a benefit package equal to the median household in-

come in the county. The measure also provides for one four-year term to serve in office."

Zuk continued, "This measure was placed on the ballot by 75,000 registered county voters. Measure J was placed on the ballot by five panicked supervisors desperate to protect their excessive pay and benefit packages. Touted as an effort to replace an 'outdated' charter containing sexist gender pronouns and dated workplace governance procedures, the measure was actually designed by county attorneys to protect supervisor compensation and consolidate power in the hands of the county bureaucracy. Measure J was barely approved, squeaking out just over 50 percent of the vote. With both of the two competing measures passing, Article II Section 10 of the California Constitution states, 'If provisions of two or

more measures approved at the same election conflict, the provisions of the measure receiving the highest number of affirmative votes shall prevail.' Because Measure K has received significantly more votes than Measure J, and the two measures conflict, Measure K will be implemented while none of the provisions in Measure J will stand. In previous rulings, the Supreme Court of California stated, 'If the measures propose alternative regulatory schemes, a fundamental conflict exists. In those circumstances, section 10(b) does not require or permit either the court or the agency charged with the responsibility of implementing the measure or measures to enforce any of the provisions of the measure which received the lesser affirmative vote.'"

Zuk said, "County Supervisors are blatantly attempting to subvert

the expressed will of the people with respect to Measure K. Three days following the certification of the county election, the board of supervisors filed an injunction in an arrogant attempt to stop the implementation of Measure K. As of Friday, December 4, 2020, the board of supervisors had made no formal mention of the lawsuit on their website. This despite the fact that attorneys from The Sutton Law Firm, funded with taxpayers' resources doled out by the board of supervisors, will be in court on Monday, December 7, seeking a temporary restraining order against the clerk of the board which would halt the implementation of Measure K. The lawsuit comes just days after the announcement of a payout in which the county granted \$65 million in taxpayer money to multimillionaire Jeffrey Burrem and the Colonies

Partners. This is an example of the horrendous performance supervisors provided managing the county's finances. In fact a butcher's bill created by a runaway county budget meshed with cavalier management of the county pension fund has bankrupted the county. Rather than forcing the bureaucracy to live within its means, which is supposed to be job number one for elected representatives, the county's elected officials have worked hand-in-glove with senior bureaucrats to fleece the county's working-class residents. This sustained track record of abysmal performance is the reason Measure K was placed on the ballot. Elected supervisors should be partnering with the electorate to ensure the measure is implemented as approved by voters. Instead, San Bernardino County's elected officials continue a long history

## Chino Hills And Hesperia Councils Confer Mayoral Appointments On Their Youngest Members *from front page*

Valley and Yucca Valley, the city or town councils select from among their ranks a mayor to wield the gavel during meetings and serve as the ceremonial head of government.

The 40-year-old Johsz is something of a creature of government. At the age of 22, shortly after graduating from the University of California at Berkeley with a degree in political science, Johsz began a one-year fellowship with the California Assembly, which lasted from November 2002 until October 2003. A Republican, he went to work as a district representative for then-Congressman Gary Miller in October 2004. He remained in that position until September 2007. He immediately began working in the office of then-San Bernardino County Fourth

District Supervisor Gary Ovitt, staying with Ovitt's office for seven years, rising to the position of Ovitt's deputy chief of staff. In 2014, then-Assemblyman Curt Hagman, who was being termed out of the state legislature, seized control of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee, from which position he withdrew political support from Ovitt as a power play in his successful effort to persuade Ovitt not to seek reelection so that he, Hagman, could take up the Fourth District supervisorial office himself. Because of the bitterness within the Ovitt camp over the fashion in which Hagman had disenfranchised Ovitt and was seeking to dominate politics in the Chino Valley, Johsz departed from Ovitt's office in September 2014, two months prior to Hagman being sworn in as Fourth District supervisor. Directly thereafter, Johsz went to work for Athens Services as government lobbyist.

While with Ovitt's office, Johsz was elected

to the Chino Valley Independent Fire District board of directors.

In 2016, the City of Chino Hills was pressured by the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund to transition from an at-large voting system in selecting members of its city council to a by-district arrangement. Johsz, working with Richard Austin, drew up an electoral district map for Chino Hills that was considered by the city council along with three other council district maps, one drawn by Democratic Party activist Jim Gallagher, another by resident Luis Esparza and one drawn up by the National Demographics Corporation. Ultimately, despite the city paying National Demographics Corporation over \$30,000 for its work, the city council selected the map drawn up by Johsz and Austin to form its council districts.

Later that year, the city council appointed Johsz to the council to replace Ed Graham, whose term was not scheduled to end until shortly after the November 2018 elec-

tion. Johsz left the Chino Valley Fire Board to accept the council appointment. In 2018, Johsz was elected to a four-year term representing Chino Hills' District 4, where he resides. That district encompasses Fairfield Ranch and Los Serranos.

Johsz, 40, remains employed as the director of government affairs with the trash hauler Athens services, a position which involves his seeking to keep the company on good terms with local municipalities, particularly ones where Athens has trash hauling franchises conferred upon it by city councils, as well as with those cities where Athens has designs on competing for future franchises.

In addition to his degree from Berkeley, Johsz holds a masters degree in public administration from Cal State University, Dominguez Hills.

This week, the Hesperia City Council at its regular council meeting on Tuesday selected Cameron Gregg to lead the city as its next mayor, succeeding Larry Bird in

that role. Gregg, 30, has been on the city council since he defeated former Mayor/Councilman Paul Russ in 2018. The move to elevate Gregg to mayor came on a 4-to-1 vote, with Councilwoman Rebekah Swanson dissenting. Swanson is supported by and is a member of the political machine headed by former Hesperia Councilman Jeremiah Brosowske. Brosowske was once in favor with the Hesperia political establishment, and he was appointed in July 2018 to succeed the late Hesperia Mayor Russ Blewett after Blewett's death in office in May 2018. But a power struggle ensued subsequently in which Councilman/former Mayor Bill Holland, who had militated to ensure Brosowske's appointment in 2018, came to loggerheads with Brosowske. Brosowske defeated Brigit Bennington in the November 2018 election, but in September 2019, Holland joined forces with Gregg and Bird to vote to remove Brosowske from office, based on their conten-

tion that Brosowske was not living in Hesperia. Swanson sided with Brosowske on that issue, and Swanson opposed the move by Gregg, Bird and Holland to appoint Bennington to replace Brosowske.

This year, Bennington was unopposed in a special election called by the council to select someone to serve out the final two years of the term Brosowske was elected to in 2018; Swanson was reelected; and Bird, too, was reelected. Thus, Gregg is part of the ruling coalition on the Hesperia Council that includes Bird, Holland and Bennington.

An Army veteran, Gregg is the chief executive officer of True Liberty Protection Services, a company founded by his father, Kelly Gregg, who is on the board of the Hesperia Recreation and Park District. Cameron Gregg's younger brother, Cody, is a board member with the Hesperia Unified School District.

-Mark Gutglueck

## Combination Of Cutting Corners On Environmental Certifications & Exorbitant Fee For Contesting Planning Commission Decisions Resulting In More Lawsuits Against Upland Government *from page 9*

approval the commission is to give to the project.

Even before that hearing is to be held next Wednesday, a city resident, Alipio De Veyra, represented by attorney Cory Briggs, came forward to appeal the commission's approval of the mitigated negative declaration for the project. Ensuing from that appeal are a host of further of considerations and implications.

In 2018, a differently composed city council under the leadership of Mayor Debbie Stone raised the fee for filing an appeal of a planning commission decision from \$680 to \$6,800, a ten-fold increase. The city's rationale in that change was to make a development-friendly gesture, one that would prevent what some pro-development city of-

ficials and many in the building industry considered to be frivolous obstructions of projects in the city. An unintended consequence of that, however, is that for those who are not engaged in frivolity and who feel there is legitimate grounds to challenge a planning commission decision, the appeal process became expensive, and in some cases, prohibitively expensive. For those determined to make an issue of decisions by the planning commission they felt were flawed, ill-based or wrong, they on occasion moved to other options. One of those was taking legal action to challenge such decisions. In such cases, a first expense is that of filing the suit at the courthouse. The lawsuit filing fee in San Bernardino County is \$450.

There is no standard cost for retaining an attorney. A typical retainer runs in the \$5,000 range. Thus, a person displeased with a planning commission decision can go to court for somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5,450, which compares favorably with \$6,800. The services of certain lawyers can be had for a retainer of \$2,500 or even less. In some cases, if a lawyer is convinced of the validity of a potential lawsuit, he or she will agree to take on the case for no cost, banking on the prospect of prevailing in the matter, in which case the losing party – in the instant cases that being the City of Upland – must defray the prevailing party's legal fees.

At present, the City of Upland is a defendant in 55 legal cases brought against it.

The *Sentinel* is reliably informed that shortly after next Wednesday's planning commission hearing at which it is anticipated

that panel will give go-ahead to Yellow Iron Development's warehouse proposal on 11<sup>th</sup> Street, an appeal of that decision will be made, and thereafter, the city will be hit with a 56<sup>th</sup> lawsuit targeting the approval of the project without it being subjected to a full-blown environmental impact report.

The representative of one of the several newly-formed citizens activist groups expressed determination to bring to a halt the City of Upland's pattern of giving environmental certification to substantial development projects in the city using the far less stringent mitigated negative declaration process in lieu of more comprehensive environmental impact reports. Lois Sicking Dieter told the *Sentinel* that she believes the city is abusing the option of using mitigated negative declarations on projects that should be thoroughly evaluated for their environmental consequences, and that

this is occurring with unacceptable frequency in the City of Gracious Living as the economy accelerates into permanent recovery mode from the seven-year-long economic downturn that began in 2007 and subsided in 2014 and it is now moving beyond the hiccoughs accompanying the coronavirus pandemic.

The defeat of Mayor Debbie Stone in the November 3 election presented what some city residents felt was an opportunity for the city's various grassroots organizations to dialogue with the city on changing its policy with regard to eschewing intensive environmental impact examination standards on development proposals. Nevertheless, Stone is being replaced with Councilman Bill Velto, who is recognized as being even more positively disposed toward the development community than Stone. With Velto fresh off his electoral victory in which he was

heavily backed by the building industry, the prospect that Velto will respond positively to requests that the city intensify its environmental certification procedure is dim, those activists believe. Thus, they are set on pursuing a strategy of litigating in every instance in which they believe the environmental examinations for projects approved in the city were inadequate. Their theory is that as the city's costs in defending such suits mount, taken together with the success of at least some of those suits where the city will be forced to rescind the project approvals already given and undertake a more comprehensive environmental certification process, city officials will eventually evolve to a policy of paying greater attention to the concerns of residents with regard to the projects being proposed in the city.

-Mark Gutglueck