

Public Unaware Four New Lanes On The I-10 Freeway Will Require Tolls

By Mark Gutglueck

For months on end commuters on the I-10 Freeway between Montclair and Ontario have dealt with the inconvenience and hazard of bridge augmentation and construction and the paradoxical narrowing of the freeway as efforts to widen it are ongoing.

The work is extensive; upon completion the existing four lanes in both directions will be increased by two more east-

bound lanes and two west-bound lanes, transforming the freeway in that span from a modern eight lane interstate to a 12-lane superhighway.

The *Sentinel* has spoken with a cross section of county residents who use the Interstate 10 Freeway on a constant basis, primarily in traveling to and from their place of employment. Most acknowledged that they have found the construction along the freeway, involving lane

closures and temporary narrowing of the entire thoroughfare, to be bothersome, indeed irritating, but generally reflect a stoic and understanding resignation at having to deal with a situation in which they have no choice. The majority have said they are putting up with the hassle because they anticipate being patient will, in time and upon the completion of the project, make the freeway safer and more travelable, increasing the

freeway's current capacity by half again.

Upon being told that the new lanes will not be in place until 2024, most expressed dismay at having to endure the current situation for another two years.

That sentiment was mild, however, in comparison to the reaction members of the common citizenry express upon being informed that the construction work they are encountering on a

daily basis is taking place to make way for toll lanes being added to the freeway.

While it is true that many or most local elected officials know the nature of the lanes being constructed, virtually no citizens at large know that in order for them to use the final product of the "improvement" under way, they will need to pay for it.

Unknown at this time is the degree to which San Bernardino **See P 2**

Nestlé Hid Its Lack Of Rights To Arrowhead Spring Water Before \$4.3B Buyout

Did a multinational corporation based in Switzerland last year hoodwink a consortium of primarily American investors when it sold them its water assets valued at \$4.3 billion by successfully hiding the questionable nature and perhaps even non-existence of the water-drafting rights of one of the more prominent companies acquired in that deal?

That question is a primary matter at issue, among others, in a hearing before the California State Water Resources Control Board that is to begin on Monday, January 10, in which questions about whether continued unbridled extraction of water from a canyon at the 5,200 foot elevation level in the San Bernardino Mountains can continue.

In March 2021, Nestlé

S.A., a food and drink processing conglomerate headquartered in Vevey, Vaud, Switzerland, sold its Nestlé Waters North America division, with the exception of its bottling rights to Perrier, to One Rock Capital Partners, LLC, in partnership with Metropoulos & Company.

Nestlé Waters North America existed as Nestlé's operations per-

taining to bottling drinking water in the United States and Canada, including eight of the leading water bottling operations in the United States. Upon the sale being completed to One Rock Capital and Metropoulos, Nestlé Waters North America was redubbed BlueTriton Brands.

Among the most iconic of the brands now in the possession of BlueTriton

is Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water.

Water originating in the San Bernardino Mountains and using the Arrowhead brand in one form or another has been marketed at least since 1909. Questions have long existed, however, as to whether the water rights originally claimed, attributed or granted to Arrowhead Puritas, the corporate predecessor **See P 3**

Reapportioned Into Another Democratic Senator's District, Leyva Elects To Leave Office

Faced with the prospect of having to either relocate her residence or duke it out with a sister Democrat to remain in the California Legislature, State Senator Connie Leyva has opted out of running for reelection this year.

Leyva, who was originally elected in 2014 in Senate District 20 with 62.4 percent of the vote and returned to office in 2018 with an even more

impressive 69.5 percent voter support, could have sought reelection under the state's current term limit rules that allow a state senator to serve three terms. This year's redistricting, however, changed the boundaries of the 20th Senate District, including removing Chino, where Leyva lives, from it entirely. Instead, Chino now falls within the newly-drafted Senate District 22, which also includes On-

tario, Pomona, West Covina, and Baldwin Park, the home of incumbent District 22 Senator Susan Rubio, also a Democrat.

Leyva made no mention of Rubio nor how her district had been reapportioned out from under her in announcing her departure.

"For the past seven years... I have worked on and passed groundbreaking legislation to empower survivors of rape and

sexual assault, strengthen enforcement of wage theft violations, expand career technical education programs that lead to well-paying jobs, ban secret settlements in cases of workplace harassment and discrimination, increase access to safe and equitable reproductive health care, reduce truck pollution, and protect California's environment," she said.

"COVID-19 has al-

lowed us to reevaluate our priorities and what truly matters in our lives," she said. "I thank my family, friends, staff, colleagues and everyone that has supported Team Leyva through this journey. Our work is certainly not over and I will continue delivering over the next few months on the vital legislative and constituent work that Californians have come to expect from our team."

Rodriguez Gets 270 Days For Trespassing & Disturbance; Gomez Heading To Trial

Robert Rodriguez on Monday, January 3 was sentenced to 270 days in county jail on his two misdemeanor convictions on trespassing and disturbing a public meeting growing out of his association with Victorville Councilman Blanca Gomez, one of Victorville Mayor Debra Jones' political rivals.

Rodriguez was with Gomez at the Panera

Bread bakery-café on June 2, 2021 when he became involved in an argument over his having vaped inside the café premises. The sheriff's department was summoned, and he and Gomez were cited for interfering with the operation of the business.

On July 6 at the Victorville City Council meeting Rodriguez was asked to leave when officials felt he was interfering with

the conducting of the meeting.

At the July 20 Victorville City Council meeting, he was arrested when his video-recording of the proceedings antagonized Mayor Jones, particularly when he aimed his camera at her husband, Ernest Jones, who was also present.

Gomez was arrested along with Rodriguez on July 20 and charged with

him on November 1. Rodriguez did not waive his right to a speedy trial and endured an 18-day jury trial between December 2 and December 28. Conspiracy to disturb a public meeting and two resisting arrest charges against him were dropped. The interfering with a business charge was converted to trespassing and he was convicted on that charge. He was convicted on the

charge of disturbing the July 20 meeting, but was acquitted on the charge of disturbing the July 6 meeting.

Gomez waived her right to a speedy trial. She was arraigned on Tuesday January 4 with her attorney, Raj Maline, entering not guilty pleas for her before Judge Scott Seeley on six misdemeanor charges relating to the June 2 and July 20 incidents.

California AG Wants A Federal Court's Second Guess On SB Eastgate Cargo Facility

California Attorney General Rob Bonta on Monday asked the entire U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to review a 2-to-1 decision of a panel of that court in November that rejected his office's challenge of the approval given to the Eastgate Air Cargo facility project, a 660,000-square-foot logistics center to be built on the grounds of San Bernardino International Airport.

Two months ago, with Ninth Circuit Judge Johnnie Rawlinson dissenting, her Ninth Circuit colleagues Eugene Siler and Patrick Bumatay entered a prevailing opinion that former California Attorney General Xavier Becerra and a group of environmentalists did not make a convincing showing that the Federal Aviation Administration failed to meet its obligation to give adequate consideration to the environmental impacts of the freight-handling and distribution operation before approving it, and gave inadequate consideration to the overall and cumulative effect of emissions from vehicles and machinery at the proposed site on nearby residences, schools and other places where individuals sensitive to that pollution live or frequent.

Bonta, as Becerra's successor, requested that the full appellate court take up the matter because, he said, judges Siler's and Bumatay's "decision allowing an agency to rest the project's approval on a flawed environmental analysis where impacts are highly uncertain and controversial conflicts with Ninth Circuit and Supreme Court precedents."

Having Squandered Measure I Tax Money On Servicing Bond Financing Debt, SBCTA To Charge Motorists To Use The I-10 Freeway *from front page*

County's citizenry will seek to hold those responsible for saddling the region with a toll lane system to account politically. The cities at the extreme west end of the county through which the first phase of the freeway toll system is to be located are Montclair, Upland, Ontario and Rancho Cucamonga. Other West End cities impacted by the project are Chino Hills and Chino, though the freeway does not actually traverse either of those municipalities.

Though the first phase of the I-10 Freeway toll road was previously slated to reach the I-15 Freeway in Rancho Cucamonga by 2023, officials now say that the work, including removing existing retainer and sound walls along the stretch in question, will not be completed in full until mid-2024. Thereafter, the second phase of the toll system will be initiated and is to go the county line at the far end of Yucaipa, where the I-10 moves into Riverside County.

Those responsible for the decision to convert one-third of the I-10 Freeway into toll lanes are local politicians, consisting of mayors or city council members from San Bernardino County's 24 cities and incorporated towns and the five members of the county board of supervisors, acting in concert as the county's transportation agency.

While when functioning in campaign mode those politicians will use their status as a current or one-time board member of the transportation agency to convince voters they are responsible for creating important regional infrastructure and therefore merit reelection, they frequently exploit the general public's ignorance of how local governments articulate with one another to avoid blame for action or decisions relating to regional transportation shortcomings by distancing themselves from the

county transportation agency, and carrying on as if they are not involved with it and that its decisions were made outside their capacities as county or city officials.

The county transportation agency now goes by the straightforward title of the San Bernardino County Transportation Agency and its acronym SBCTA. It adopted that new name on January 1, 2016, having previously been known as San Bernardino Associated Governments, or its acronym, SANBAG.

Founded as a council of governments and joint powers authority by the County of San Bernardino and its then-14 constituent cities – San Bernardino, Ontario, Colton, Redlands, Upland, Needles, Chino, Rialto, Barstow, Fontana, Montclair, Victorville, Loma Linda and Adelanto – it was overseen by a 19-member board of directors composed of the five county supervisors as well as representatives from those 14 incorporated cities who were either each city's mayor or designated council member. Ultimately, with the incorporation of Rancho Cucamonga, Grand Terrace, Big Bear Lake, Highland, Hesperia, Apple Valley, Chino Hills, Twentynine Palms, Yucaipa and Yucca Valley, SANBAG grew to represent 24 municipalities and the county by means of a 29-member board.

The first regional issue San Bernardino Associated Governments took on was public transit, utilizing as its seed money the ¼-cent sales tax to fund transportation projects at the local governmental level made available through the Transportation Development Act.

On December 3, 1975, SANBAG adopted its bylaws and under the leadership of its maiden president, then-Fifth District Supervisor Nancy Smith, created a public transit agency to provide bus service throughout the San Bernardino Valley, known as Omnitrans. Eventually, other transit agencies were formed to serve other areas of the county, including in the San Bernardino Mountains, the Victor Valley, Barstow and the Mojave Desert and Morongo Val-

ley.

In 1976, SANBAG was deemed San Bernardino County's transportation commission after lawmakers passed legislation allowing counties to develop their own transportation commissions. In 1986 SANBAG was designated the freeway emergency service authority in San Bernardino County, which provided emergency call boxes along the freeway and, later, a public-funded freeway roadside assistance service patrol.

By the 1980s, San Bernardino County's population was outgrowing the infrastructure needed to accommodate that population. This represented a threat to the development and real estate interests that had a financial stake in allowing that growth to proceed unabated. That continued growth was making serious inroads on the quality of life enjoyed by the county's residents. The politicians, whose careers as elected officials were being financed in large measure by the development industry, property owners and real estate speculators, were under pressure to allow the development to continue. Casting about for a way of alleviating the intensive gridlock on the I-10 Freeway that was a direct consequence of the burgeoning population, the crop of politicians in control of the county and its cities at that time – led by then-First District Supervisor Marsha Turoci, Second District Supervisor Jon Mikels, Third District Supervisor Barbara Cram Reardon, Fourth District Supervisor Larry Walker and Fifth District Supervisor Robert Hammock, sought a means by which SANBAG could be enabled to institute a locally administered taxing arrangement to be entirely devoted to transportation issues, one of the major infrastructure shortcomings besetting the overbuilt county. In 1987, that initial effort failed, as many county residents perceived that the county's politicians would not use the tax money to merely make up the regional transportation infrastructure deficit, but utilize the newly-created roads and other infrastructure as a justification to con-

tinue the past pattern of overbuilding unabated, thereby perpetuating the county's overburdened road system.

In 1989, however, SANBAG managed to establish itself with the state as the county's transportation authority, and immediately set about in an effort to get the county's residents to pass Measure I, a countywide ½ cent sales tax override with the proceeds devoted exclusively to improving transportation infrastructure.

Upon the passage of the transportation tax initiative Measure I in 1989, the politicians overseeing SANBAG made a crucial decision against banking the Measure I proceeds for three or four or five or six years to create a fund from which regional transportation projects would be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis. Instead, prompted by their own political interest in playing to the public perception that transportation improvements were indeed being carried out as well as accommodating their political donors in the development and real estate sectors by allowing further unbridled construction to proceed, the SANBAG board moved to borrow against the anticipated future revenue from Measure I and begin transportation-related projects at once.

Among these were funding the expansion of the 210 Freeway. Originally begun in 1958 as a freeway in the greater Los Angeles area of Southern California running from the Syamar district of Los Angeles east among the San Gabriel Mountain Foothill communities, the 210 Freeway in 1962 was replanned to continue all the way to Redlands. No further state or federal funding for the project had materialized after it reached Glendora in the 1970s, however. Able to use the future Measure I tax proceeds to engage in bonded indebtedness service, SANBAG issued bonds to undertake the continuation of the 210 Freeway from Pomona to San Bernardino.

In 1990, SANBAG after having itself designated as the "Congestion Management Agency" for San Bernardino County, SANBAG utilized the

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

bond proceeds to pay for the county's participation in the Southern California Regional Rail Authority, which brought Metrolink, a passenger rail service to San Bernardino County from Union Station in Los Angeles. It also funded the construction of the segment of State Route 71, or the Chino Valley Freeway, running from I-10 in Pomona to Chino Hills and then to Chino.

Making the bond arrangements and beginning the transportation improvement projects quickly served to please and placate the county's residents who had voted both for and against the approval of Measure I, and it stood as a statement that the county and city sponsors of Measure I were living up to the commitment to use the tax to undertake needed transportation-related improvements, while simultaneously serving to boost the politicians who were responsible for sponsoring it and campaigning for its passage. Nevertheless, bonding, or borrowing, against the future anticipated revenue from Measure I carried with it a downside. The proceeds from the bond sale were indeed used to begin work on those projects, but the purchasers of the bonds in short order were due interest payments within the 5 percent to 6 percent per year range that would continue for 30 years, followed by a payment equal to the face value of the bonds purchased upon the maturity of those bonds, meaning at the end of the 30-year cycle. Thus, a significant percentage of the revenue generated by Measure I over the more than 31 years that the tax it authorized has been in

place has gone not toward actual transportation improvements but servicing the debt those bonds represent, on paying the interest on the loans SANBAG, which is now known as SBCTA, has taken out.

This rerouting of Measure I money to financiers rather than going directly to traffic-alleviation efforts is an issue at the heart of SBCTA's current commitment to dedicate the four lanes being constructed on the I-10 Freeway between the Pomona/Montclair border and the I-15 Freeway to carrying motorists willing to pay a toll fee rather than typical commuters along that stretch of the highway.

While toll roads, sometimes referred to as turnpikes, have long existed in the United States, they are relatively rare in California. Many decades ago toll bridges in the San Francisco Bay Area were extant. In Northern California there are toll lanes, referred to as express lanes, on the 580, 680, 880 and 237 freeways. More than three decades ago, toll lanes were established on State Routes 73, 133, 241 and 261 in Orange County followed by express lanes on the 91 Freeway. There are express lanes on the 15 Freeway in San Diego County. What are referred to as Metro Express lanes debuted in Los Angeles County in 2012 on the I-10 and 110 freeways.

San Bernardino County was a holdout against toll lanes, but in 2014, after Rancho Cucamonga Mayor L. Dennis Michael became the president of SANBAG, Dr. Ray Wolfe, a one-time California Department of Transportation

Continued on Page 7

It Appears Nestlé Hoodwinked One Rock Capital & Metropoulos When It Sold Its North American Water Assets To Them *from front page*

to Arrowhead Spring Water, pertain to the current source of the water drawn at the 5,200-foot elevation level from Strawberry Creek in what is known as Strawberry Canyon.

There is evidence to suggest that Nestlé had come to recognize some time ago the dubious nature of its water rights claim in Strawberry Canyon.

Of significance is that BlueTriton Brand's water withdrawals are taking place on San Bernardino National Forest lands where water has been reserved since the granting of national forest standing on February 25, 1893.

Federal reserve rights and overlaying landowner groundwater rights apply in this case. Appropriation through adverse possession, known as prescriptive rights, is not applicable to U.S. Forest lands.

There is no documentation that Nestlé, from which BlueTriton Brands maintains its water rights to the water bottled as Arrowhead Spring Water descend, or that its predecessors-in-interest had any valid water rights in the San Bernardino National Forest for Upper Strawberry Canyon or the "Indian Springs" tunnels located there prior to 1893, nor pre-1914 water rights, as Nestlé claimed and BlueTriton Brands is now asserting. The early water bottlers associated with the Arrowhead name drew their water from sources other than Strawberry Creek or Strawberry Canyon, ones located at the approximate 2,000 foot level in the San Bernardino Mountains near the historic Arrowhead Hotel property.

In 1929, the California Consolidated Waters Company was formed to merge three Los Angeles-based companies that bottled and distributed "Arrowhead Water," "Puritas Water" and "Liquid Steam." The property, bottling operations, water

distribution and administration of Arrowhead Springs Company, Puritas of California Consumers Company and the water bottling division of Merchants Ice and Storage were all administered by California Consolidated Waters Company. Soon after, California Consolidated Waters, without having obtained any valid authorization or rights, put in place tunnels, boreholes and horizontal wells at the higher elevation of 5,200 feet at the headwaters to Strawberry Creek in Strawberry Canyon.

Charles Anthony, acting president of the Arrowhead Springs resort property and Arrowhead Springs Corporation, sold upper Strawberry Canyon water rights he did not own in the National Forest to California Consolidated Waters Company.

Though Arrowhead Puritas's right to draft the Strawberry Canyon water was never verified, it was not challenged for decades. The U.S. Forest Service, without verifying those rights, issued Arrowhead Puritas an annual water extraction permit for a standard fee of \$524. By the 1980s, Arrowhead Puritas was bought out by Beatrice Foods and then morphed into the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company, which acquired the still-active permit. The BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company applied to extend that permit when it expired. In 1987, while that application was still pending, Perrier purchased the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. The then-pending water extraction permit renewal required a U.S. Forest Service review of the water drafting arrangement and its environmental/ecological impact, which at that point the U.S. Forest Service did not have the immediately available resources to carry out. In a gesture of compromise, Perrier was allowed, pending the eventual Forest Service review, to continue to operate in Strawberry Canyon by simply continuing to pay the \$524-per year fee to perpetuate the water extraction under the terms of the expired permit. In 1992, when Nestlé acquired the Arrowhead

brand from Perrier, it inherited the Strawberry Canyon operation and continued to pay the \$524 annual fee without renewing the permit, which at that time existed under the name of the "Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Co.," one that was never listed legally in corporate filings, but which operated under Nestlé Waters of North America, Inc. until it was acquired by BlueTriton Brands

Nestlé's intensive water-drafting activity, which was long been decried by environmentalists, came under increasing fire as a statewide drought, which lasted for more than five years after it first manifested in 2011, advanced. In 2015 environmental groups were gearing up to file a lawsuit claiming the U.S. Forest Service had violated protocols and harmed the ecology of the mountain by allowing Nestlé Waters North America to continue its operations in Strawberry Canyon for 28 years after its permit expired. At that point, the Forest Service moved to make an environmental review. In the meantime, Nestlé continued its water extraction, pumping an average of 62.56 million gallons of water annually from the San Bernardino Mountains. Environmentalists lodged protests with the water rights division of the California Water Resources Control Board, alleging Nestlé was diverting water without rights, making unreasonable use of the water it was taking, failing to monitor the amount drawn or make an accurate accounting of the water it was taking, and wreaking environmental damage by its action.

Following a two-year investigation, state officials arrived at a tentative determination that Nestlé could continue to divert up to 26 acre-feet of water (8.47 million gallons) per year. Nestlé had gone far beyond the water drafting limit the company was entitled to, the State Water Resources Control Board said, and was actually drafting 192 acre-feet (62.56 million gallons), such that 166 acre-feet (54.09 million gallons) the company was taking was unauthorized, according

to a report released on December 21, 2017.

The water rights division recommended that Nestlé immediately end its diversions beyond the 26-acre-foot threshold or otherwise marshal evidence supporting its level of diversion.

While Nestlé continued to maintain it had established rights to roughly 190 acre-feet of water per year in Strawberry Canyon, it was unable to produce any historical record of water rights approaching the volume of its diversion. Despite that, Nestlé refused to comply, continuing to take 144 acre-feet in 2017, 141 acre-feet in 2018 and 210 acre-feet in 2019. By 2020, Nestlé was in negotiations with One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company as partnership with Metropoulos & Company for the sale of Nestlé Waters North America. In late March 2021, in what was represented as a \$4.3 billion transaction, that deal was closed. Acquired in the purchase were Poland Spring® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Deer Park® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Ozarka® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Ice Mountain® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Zephyrhills® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Arrowhead® Brand Mountain Spring Water, Pure Life® and Splash, consolidated under the name BlueTriton Brands.

On April 23, 2021, the State Water Resources Control Board issued a revised report of its investigation and a draft cease and desist order directing BlueTriton Brands, as the current owner of the Arrowhead Spring Water brand bottling company, to stop its unlawful activities, which was defined in the cease and desist order as taking any more than 7.26 acre-feet (2.342 million gallons) of water annually out of Strawberry Canyon.

BlueTriton Brands did not comply, and to enforce its order, the State Water Resources Control Board has scheduled a hearing before an administrative law judge beginning on Monday at which it will marshal what it deems will be sufficient data, documentation and

evidence in general to convince the judge to issue a binding order on BlueTriton Brands to cease its water extraction from Strawberry Canyon by anything more than 2.342 million gallons annually. BlueTriton Brands is contesting the State Water Resources Control Board's order, and is represented by Robert Donlan, Christopher Sanders and Shawnda Grady of the Sacramento-based law firm of Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan.

Of note is that there appears to be a discrepancy between the representations BlueTriton Brands made and has continued to make in its public statements as well as to investors in One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company as contrasted with the representations being made by its legal representatives in the legal jousting over water rights with the State Water Resources Control Board. Specifically, BlueTriton Brands outside the context of the hearing maintains its ownership, administration and management had fully assessed the extent and validity of the claimed water rights of the various companies it had acquired in the March 2021 deal with Nestlé. Today, however, attorney Robert Donlan of the Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan law firm filed on BlueTriton Brand's behalf a motion in limine which seeks to exclude several individuals to be called as witnesses by the State Water Resources Control Board, including those who are anticipated to weigh in with regard the limitation, or non-existence, of the water rights in Strawberry Canyon which Nestlé had formerly and which BlueTriton Brands is currently claiming. Those witnesses have testimony to offer indicating that well before BlueTriton Brands acquired Arrowhead Spring Water from Nestlé there was information available to indicate that Nestlé did not lawfully possess water rights in Strawberry Canyon.

A motion in limine is a request made of the judge by a party in a trial, hearing or official proceeding requesting that certain evidence or testimony be

excluded.

Among the witness that the State Water Resources Control Board has arrayed against BlueTriton Brands are Victor Vasquez, Rachel Dougherty, Steve Loe, Amanda Frye, Thomas Eggers and Hugh Bialecki, all of whom were active in either historical research or documenting hydrological, hydrogeological, or biological impacts of the water use patterns in Strawberry Creek in the years before Nestlé divested itself of its Arrowhead® Brand Mountain Spring Water holding.

Vasquez, Dougherty, Loe, Frye, Eggers and Bialecki do not qualify as expert witnesses, Donlan maintains.

Furthermore, Donlan maintains that the State Water Resources Control Board should not be permitted to utilize any testimony, comment, data, documentation or evidence relating to the water use patterns in Strawberry Canyon submitted after the designated public comment period that originally ran from December 20, 2017 to January 20, 2018 and which was ultimately extended to February 9, 2018 during the State Water Resources Control Board's preparation of its study, titled *Nestlé Spring Water Extractions in San Bernardino National Forest Report of Investigation*, upon which the board's restriction of BlueTriton Brand's Strawberry Canyon water extraction is based.

Despite Vasquez, Dougherty, Loe, Frye, Eggers and Bialecki having participated in research into the extent, impact and legality of Nestlé's extraction of water from Strawberry Canyon prior to the BlueTriton Brands buyout, Donlan characterized the information they had provided to the public discussion as being "irrelevant" and outside the provided-for timeline for the provision of that information to the discussion between the State Water Resources Control Board and BlueTriton Brands over the use of water from Strawberry Canyon.

"Any public comments, including documents and information, that were not
Continued on Page 7

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2129331

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: ESTEBAN GUADALUPE ACUNA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

ESTEBAN GUADALUPE ACUNA to ESTEBAN ACUNA

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: 01/24/22
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District - Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, Same as above, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: October 8, 2021
John M. Pacheco
Judge of the Superior Court.
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/17, 12/24, 12/31, 2021 & 01/07, 2022.

ABANDONMENT OF A FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME NUMBER 20210012224
The following entity was doing business as: THE BELAIRE APARTMENT HOMES 8255 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: WC WOODSONG LLC 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612

Registered with the State of Delaware
Mailing Address: 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP.

The original FBN Number was FBN 20180007520 The date of filing was 06/27/2018

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 23, 2018
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/ MICHAEL B EARL
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/13/2021
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 I1327

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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 & 01/07/2022

AMENDED NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARCUS MARCELL McCOWEN CASE NO. PROSB2100727
To all heirs, beneficiaries, credi-

Public Notices

tors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARCUS MARCELL McCOWEN:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by CLEAFERSE McCOWEN JR. in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CLEAFERSE McCOWEN JR. 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 January 18, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. December 8, 2021
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk
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.
Filed: December 8, 2021
Attorney for Alison D. Morris

R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: LENA V. MORRIS aka LENA VANDORA MORRIS

CASE NO. PROSB2101046
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of LENA V. MORRIS aka LENA VANDORA MORRIS:

A Petition for Probate has been filed by ALISON D. MORRIS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ALISON D. MORRIS be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The wills and any codi-

Public Notices

cils 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 January 18, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. December 8, 2021
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk

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.
Filed: December 8, 2021
Attorney for Alison D. Morris

R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DAVID AMADO MARTINEZ CASE NO. PROSB2101039

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DAVID AMADO MARTINEZ: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by SALLY MICHELLE ORTEGA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SALLY MICHELLE ORTEGA 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on JANUARY 27, 2022 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

Public Notices

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: December 6, 2021
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk
Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: EDWARD LEWIS CLARK CASE NO. PROSB2100861
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of EDWARD LEWIS CLARK: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on JUNE 6, 2022 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.
Filed: December 8, 2021
Attorney for Alison D. Morris

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ESPERANZA BARRON OROPEZA CASE NO. PROSB2101105

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ESPERANZA BARRON OROPEZA: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by ELIZABETH CHACON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ELIZABETH CHACON 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on JUNE 6, 2022 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.

Public Notices

son 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 the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: EDWARD LEWIS CLARK CASE NO. PROSB2100861
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of EDWARD LEWIS CLARK: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on JUNE 6, 2022 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.
Filed: December 6, 2021
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk
Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ESPERANZA BARRON OROPEZA CASE NO. PROSB2101105

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ESPERANZA BARRON OROPEZA: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by ELIZABETH CHACON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ELIZABETH CHACON 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on JUNE 6, 2022 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.

Public Notices

son 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 the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 24 and 31, 2021 & January 7, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF SYLVIA CORRALEZ Case No. PROSB2100955
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of SYLVIA CORRALEZ

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Christina Bailey in the Superior Court of California, County of LOS ANGELES.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Christina Bailey 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 in Superior Court of California of SAN BERNARDINO, SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT-PROBATE 247 W. THIRD STREET in Dept. S36 at 9:00 AM on 1/25/2022.

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:
CICELY T. RAY
4740 GREEN RIVER ROAD, SUITE 314, CORONA, CA, 92880
951-735-2488
Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on:
12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022

A HEARING on the petition will be held on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 111 N. Hill St., Los Angeles, CA 90012.

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:
RICHARD A RODGERS ESQ SBN 210196 SHANE DIGIUSEPPE & RODGERS LLP 3125 OLD CANEJO ROAD THOUSAND OAKS CA 91320 CN983114 CORRALEZ Dec 31, 2021, Jan 7, 14, 2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO CASE NO. PROSB2100620
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by PAMELA A. HERNANDEZ, in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PAMELA A. HERNANDEZ, be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court.

Public Notices

TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO

CASE NO. PROSB2100620
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by PAMELA A. HERNANDEZ, in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PAMELA A. HERNANDEZ, be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests the decedent's will 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 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA OF SAN BERNARDINO, SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT-PROBATE 247 W. THIRD STREET in Dept. S36 at 9:00 AM on 1/25/2022.

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:
CICELY T. RAY
4740 GREEN RIVER ROAD, SUITE 314, CORONA, CA, 92880
951-735-2488
Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on:
12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131227
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ to MARTHA JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ
THE COURT ORDERS that

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 Superior Court of California of SAN BERNARDINO, SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT-PROBATE 247 W. THIRD STREET in Dept. S36 at 9:00 AM on 1/25/2022.

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:
CICELY T. RAY
4740 GREEN RIVER ROAD, SUITE 314, CORONA, CA, 92880
951-735-2488
Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on:
12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131227
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ to MARTHA JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ
THE COURT ORDERS that

Public Notices

all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 1/24/2022 Time: 09:00 AM Department: S-17 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Civil Division

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition. Dated: 10/28/2021 John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/24, 12/31, 2021 and 1/7 & 1/14, 2022.

FBN 20210012541 The following entity is doing business as: ESOTERIC PUBLICATIONS 7615 ETIWANDA AVENUE, SUITE 534 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; MICHAEL JOURDAIN 7615 ETIWANDA AVENUE SUITE 534 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: December 3, 2021

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/ MICHAEL JOURDAIN Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/21/2021 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office SAN BERNARDINO County Clerk By:/Deputy I1327

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 on 12/24, 12/31, 2021 and 1/7 & 1/14, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210011826

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: PUFF AND UP SMOKE AND VAPE SHOP, 1705 E. WASHINGTON ST., 122A, COLTON, CA, 92324, SAN BERNARDINO

Mailing Address: , PUFF AND UP INC 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/DEEP SHANKAR SUBEDI This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 11/24/2021

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 3/28/2017 County Clerk,

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

Public Notices

Code). 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012095

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: FRESHENUP, 1705 E. WASHINGTON ST STE 111, COLTON, CA, 92324, SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address: 23175 GLEN-DORA DR, GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313, PUFF AND UP INC

Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION

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/DEEP SHANKAR SUBEDI This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/6/2021

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 11/22/2021

County Clerk, 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).

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012527

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: GVK CONSULTANCY, 8279 HIGHRIDGE PL, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA, 91730, SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address: , GVKCONSULTANCY.COM LLC

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

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/KAVITHA PEDDI This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/21/2021

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,

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).

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012330

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: MBA BAGGA ENTERPRISES LLC, 15091 KITFOX LN, VICTORVILLE, CA, 92394, SAN BERNARDINO

Mailing Address: 15091 KITFOX LN, VICTORVILLE, CA, 92394, MBA BAGGA ENTERPRISES LLC

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

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/RAGHBIR BAGGA This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/15/2021

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,

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

Public Notices

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).

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DOROTHY JO MIMS-MOYLE CASE NO. PROSB2101125 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DOROTHY JO MIMS-MOYLE: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by MARJORIE E. MASON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MARJORIE E. MASON 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on JANUARY 31, 2022 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 the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENT-ER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Angel Rosales

CASE NO. PROSB2100936

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Angel Rosales:

A Petition for Probate has been filed by Alma Moreno in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Alma Moreno 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9 a.m. on JANUARY 20, 2022 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 Alma Moreno R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 3, 10 & 17, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE. NO. PROSB 2101083 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JENNIFER FEJZIC in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JENNIFER FEJZIC 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 in Dept. No. S35 at 9 a.m. on JANUARY 20, 2022 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 Alma Moreno R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 3, 10 & 17, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131872

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA to CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA-TIANGCO

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 2/15/2022 Time: 09:00 AM Department: S-16 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Civil Division

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 12/28/2021 John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/24, 2021 and 1/7, 1/14 & 1/21, 2022.

FBN 20210012606 The following person is doing business as: STALWART TOOL COMPANY 18154 PINE AVE FONTANA, CA 92335 LUIS ANGEL LEYVA 18154 PINE AVE FON-

TANA, CA 92335 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/ LUIS ANGEL LEYVA Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/06/2021

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 I1327

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 on 12/24, 2021 and 1/7, 1/14 & 1/21, 2022.

Public Notices

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 20, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. November 12, 2021 Kimberly Tilley, Deputy 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 Jennifer Fejzic: Jennifer Daniel 220 Nordina St. Redlands, CA 92373 Telephone No: (909) 792-9244 Fax No: (909) 235-4733 Email address: team@lawofficeofjenniferdaniel.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

ABANDONMENT OF A FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

NUMBER 20210012224 The following entity was doing business as: THE BELAIRE APARTMENT HOMES 8255 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: WC WOODSONG LLC 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612

Registered with the State of Delaware Mailing Address: 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP.

The original FBN Number was FBN 20180007520 The date of filing was 06/27/2018

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 23, 2018

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/ MICHAEL B EARL Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/13/2021 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 I1327

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 & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 & 01/07/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012086

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: REDLANDS SOURDOUGH COMPANY, REDLANDS SOURDOUGH CO, RSCO, 426 WEST OLIVE AVE, #6, REDLANDS, CA, 92373, SAN BERNARDINO

Mailing Address: , REDLANDS SOURDOUGH COMPANY LLC Business is Conducted By: AN LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

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/NEANDER TABINGO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/6/2021

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,

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 business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions

Public Notices

held in Dept. No. S35 at 9 a.m. on JANUARY 20, 2022 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 Alma Moreno R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 3, 10 & 17, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131872

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA to CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA-TIANGCO

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 2/15/2022 Time: 09:00 AM Department: S-16 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Civil Division

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 12/28/2021 John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/24, 2021 and 1/7, 1/14 & 1/21, 2022.

FBN 20210012606 The following person is doing business as: STALWART TOOL COMPANY 18154 PINE AVE FONTANA, CA 92335 LUIS ANGEL LEYVA 18154 PINE AVE FON-

TANA, CA 92335 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/ LUIS ANGEL LEYVA Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/06/2021

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 I1327

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 on 12/24, 2021 and 1/7, 1/14 & 1/21, 2022.

Public Notices

TANA, CA 92335 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/ LUIS ANGEL LEYVA Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/06/2021

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 I1327

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 on 12

Public Notices

aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ GUIOVANYA MARTINEZ, OWNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021
 Thereby 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

Public Notices

County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CNB-B01202201CV
 FBN 20210012415
 The following person is doing business as: GENERAL THINGS FOR YOU 23859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); GONZALO TOVAR 23859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307; RAMIRO TOVAR 923859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307
 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

Public Notices

of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ GONZALO TOVAR, GENERAL PARTNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/17/2021
 Thereby 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

Public Notices

County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CN-BB01202202SL
 FBN 20210012442
 The following person is doing business as: INLAND MARKET 11436 CEDAR AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); PHOENIX MARKET, LLC 11436 CEDAR AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316
 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL
 The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: DEC 07, 2021
 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

Public Notices

becomes Public Record upon filing.
 s/ SYEDA ZAIDI, OWNER/ MANAGER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/20/2021
 Thereby 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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021,

Public Notices

12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CN-BB01202203MT
 FBN 20210012431
 The following person is doing business as: W&B AUTO BODY 16572 CERES AVE SPC #4 FONTANA, CA 92335; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ANDREZ MORA 1672 CERES AVE. SPC #4 FONTANA, CA 92335
 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.

Public Notices

s/ ANDREZ MORA, OWNER
 Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/17/2021
 Thereby 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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CNB-B01202204IR

Mayors Dutrey & Michael, Councilman Wapner In League With Supervisor Hagman And Director Wolfe Championed Toll Lanes from page 7

tion Agency executive who in 2012 was hired as SANBAG's executive director, began pushing for San Bernardino County to construct toll lanes.

The concept was by no means universally accepted.

Then-Fontana City Councilman Michael Tahan, who represented his city on the SANBAG board, resisted the idea, as did others. The proposed additions to the freeway were denounced by opponents as "Rolls Royce lanes" or "Cadillac lanes" or "Mercedes lanes" or "Lexus lanes" by opponents, who said only the wealthy would be able to afford to use them.

There were arguments presented against the toll lanes along practical grounds, including that they would not lessen gridlock but intensify it. Observation of toll roads elsewhere in Southern California - in Los Angeles County and Orange County - demonstrates that the freeways where they are located are regularly tied up, with the toll lanes being marginally used. This creates a spectacle whereby three, four or even five lanes of traffic will be very slow moving or not moving, while next to them is or are one or two lanes being hardly used at all in which cars are zooming by at speeds nearing, at or exceeding the speed limit. In this way, travel space on the freeway is squandered, and the lion's share of traffic moves at a far

slower pace than it would if all lanes were available to the freeway's users.

Whether out of principle or financial consideration, the majority of freeway motorists in Southern California are unwilling to pay the money required to utilize toll lanes. For a significant number of people - perhaps even a majority of people - this comes across as unfair and an unwise apportionment of public money. California's motorists pay substantial vehicle licensing fees. California's motorists pay the highest gasoline tax in the nation. In San Bernardino County, residents have elected to pay the Measure I tax based upon the assurance the money would be used to facilitate the construction of adequate transportation infrastructure. Yet, in San Bernardino County at present, those using the 10 Freeway are being forced to spend more time on the freeway than they would otherwise because of the ongoing construction of the toll lanes, and when that construction is completed, they will see virtually no personal benefit whatsoever. Those residents, as taxpayers, were and are in some fashion supporting the cost of creating a freeway system for collective use. Yet the toll system being built will exclude them from using the lanes being built within the freeway system they are paying for, unless they are willing to pay more money on top of the taxes and fees they have already paid.

The SANBAG board in 2015, upon considering all factors, in particular that there was inadequate revenue flowing into SANBAG's coffers to pay for increasing the number of lanes on the freeway, opted to undertake the toll lane project.

Of note is that in Orange County, the toll lanes built on state routes 73, 133, 241 and 261 were completed without, officials claim, the use of public funds, but rather were financed through the issuance of a special class of bonds dubbed "toll revenue bonds" sold to private investors. The bonds are debt serviced by the tolls and development impact fees imposed on the development industry and collected by the various local governments where the toll roads exist. The concept in Orange County was that over the 30-year life of the bonds, the debt to the bondholders would essentially be serviced by the tolls paid by the toll road users, and after the bonded indebtedness was retired in full, the toll roads, which are owned by the California Department of Transportation, would cease being toll roads and become integrated with the existing non-fee lanes on those state routes. Because the toll roads were not used to the extent anticipated, the bonds were not debt serviced in conformance with the scheduled pay-off plan. As a consequence, the absorption of the toll roads into the regional road infrastructure such that everyone can use them without paying - which was supposed to have occurred by now - has not yet taken place. Those stretches of state highway will remain as toll roads until 2050.

In the case of the toll roads in San Bernardino County, involving both those to be constructed on the I-10 Freeway and on the I-15 Freeway as well, the financing is being handled through the San Bernardino County Transportation Agency. Yet there has been no explicit public discussion

with regard to the eventual sunset of the lanes as ones requiring a toll for their use, leaving open the possibility that they will remain toll lanes into perpetuity.

The circle of those responsible for the conception and actuation of the San Bernardino County toll lane plan is a small one. Foremost within that group is Dr. Raymond Wolfe, SBCTA's executive director, and Rancho Cucamonga Mayor L. Dennis Michael, who was president of the SANBAG board when the San Bernardino County toll road plan was hatched. Others crucial to seeing the concept through are current SBCTA President Curt Hagman; Montclair Mayor John Dutrey, his city's representative on the SBCTA board; Upland Councilman Carlos Garcia, Upland's representative on the SBCTA board; Ontario Councilman Alan Wapner, his city's representative on the SBCTA board; and Second District County Supervisor Janice Rutherford. The majority of the past and current members of the SBCTA board acceded to establishing the I-10 toll lanes.

In addition to being SBCTA chairman, Hagman, is now the chairman of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors. Moreover, the cities of Montclair, Upland and Ontario, through which the I-10 toll lanes will run, lie within Hagman's Fourth District. Nevertheless, Hagman steadfastly refuses to publicly discuss SBCTA's commitment to establishing the toll lanes on the 10 Freeway. In referencing the project, he makes allusion to adding lanes, but does not mention that motorists will have to pay to use them. He is scheduled to stand

for reelection later this year.

Similarly, Wapner is standing for reelection in Ontario this year. He, too, has refused to go on record with regard to the toll lanes, aware that the vast majority of his constituents have no inkling that in order for them to use the lanes on the I-10 Freeway that are now being constructed in their city and are scheduled for completion in two years, they will be charged a fee. Keeping those who will be called upon to vote either for him or his competitors in this year's election in the dark on that issue will enhance his reelection chances.

Mayor Dutrey is not scheduled to run for election until 2024. Still, like both Hagman and Wapner, he spurned the *Sentinel's* offer to share his perspective on the toll lanes, say whether he was and remains in favor of establishing them, and explain his rationale for supporting them if he in fact favors their construction.

BlueTriton Was Not Up To Speed On Arrowhead's Questionable H₂O Rights Status Prior To Purchase from page 3

submitted by the February 9, 2018 public comment deadline should not have been considered by the State Water Board in its investigation and preparation of the 2021 Report of Investigation and Draft Cease and Desist Order," Donlan wrote in his motion in limine submitted today. "Due process and fundamental fairness also require exclusion of any such documents and information. This is a matter in which the State Water Board seeks to substantially terminate certain of

tion.

Councilman Garcia was not a member of the Upland City Council and therefore not a board member with SANBAG when the decision to go forward with creating the I-10 toll lanes was made.

Supervisor Rutherford said that she "reluctantly" supported the toll lane project because SANBAG/SBCTA had committed its available revenue elsewhere and the funding to widen the freeway was not available. She will be termed out of office at the end of the year.

Mayor Michael was unwilling to get into a public discussion relating to the toll lanes. He, too, is scheduled to stand for reelection this year.

Dr. Wolfe likewise refused to speak on the public record with regard to the toll lane project, indicating in making his refusal that he did not believe he could offer a cogent defense of the project.

Continued on Page 8

BlueTriton Brands' water rights. As such, BlueTriton Brands is entitled to a full and fair hearing, including an opportunity to defend its rights. BlueTriton Brands cannot be required to defend against new information and that which was not at issue in the State Water Board's investigation and issuance of the 2021 Report of Investigation and Draft Cease and Desist Order."

Just before press time, a spokesman for BlueTriton Brands told the *Sentinel*, "BlueTriton Brands did comprehensive due diligence before the purchase of Nestlé Waters North America. We look forward to continuing sustainable operations in accordance with all government regulations."

-Mark Gutglueck

With Election Approaching, SBCTA Board Members Are Reluctant To Own Their Decision To Widen The I-10 Freeway With Toll Lanes *from page 7*

For virtually all of those involved with SBCTA – board members or staff – they currently enjoy the luxury of the public’s lack of awareness that the current augmentation of the I-10 Freeway consists of toll lanes, and the concomitant misassumption that the project involves a widening of the freeway which upon completion will be of use and benefit to all motorists using the freeway.

That grace period will come to a close as soon as the lanes are in place along with the signs and electronic devices that will warn against and restrict anyone who has not paid a toll from using them, some members of the SBCTA board acknowledged.

“I would imagine there is going to be some controversy,” Chino Mayor Eunice Ulloa, her city’s SBCTA representative, told the *Sentinel*. “Though many articles informing the public of what is going to happen have been written and published, I don’t think people know that is what is coming. I don’t think the public is tuned into what’s happening. I would guess that the majority of people will not be real happy with having to pay to use the freeway.”

Ulloa said the county’s residents rightfully feel that they have paid for the extra lanes on the I-10 that are being built.

“The people passed Measure I, the half-cent sales tax, and it was supposed to help with transportation issues, but like everything these days, the money does not go as far as we would like it to. In order to reduce congestion on the freeways, the powers that be felt that toll lanes would help to reduce the gridlock. That remains to be seen. Many of us were not convinced that was the best way to go.”

Ulloa continued, “There is a question about the best and most efficient

way to spend our local tax dollars.”

She said it could well have been a mistake to bond against the future Measure I tax revenue back in 1990 rather than exercising patience and accumulating a nest egg to utilize directly in undertaking traffic system improvements.

“That’s why we have advisors, to help us to sort out those kinds of issues, to look at inflationary factors and whether we should wait and pay as we go or whether with the rise in costs, increasing wages and the price of materials it is better to begin work right off,” Mayor Ulloa said. “With China snapping up steel and concrete, causing material costs to rise, we need experts to look at the best way to go. It might be better to try to beat inflation by getting the projects done immediately before the costs escalate. But that doesn’t always work. It is never a win-win. We have done some pay-as-you go projects in Chino. We have also borrowed against our assets and future revenue when interest rates were low and we were able to get ahead of inflation. But that strategy does not work in every case. Nobody has a crystal ball to know what is the best course. The public wants improvements now, and sometimes mistakes are made.”

Ontario Mayor Paul Leon said constructing toll lanes on the I-10 Freeway was not SBCTA’s best option, nor is charging the county’s residents to use transportation infrastructure they have already paid for justifiable.

“I am in 100 percent agreement with widening the freeway, but I am not in agreement that we should have taxpayers pay for lanes they will not be using,” he said. “We are faced with this monster we call addressing the gridlock on our freeways and we are continually paying huge amounts of money to feed that monster but every time we do, we don’t have enough money to slay the monster and it keeps growing and it’s getting bigger and bigger.”

Leon said, “We were told that if we build the 210 Freeway it will serve

to end the congestion on the 10 Freeway, and so we built the 210 Freeway and now what we have is congestion on the 210 Freeway and 10 Freeway and the 60 Freeway.”

The answer goes beyond accommodating more cars on the freeway, Mayor Leon said. He said providing other commuting options such as the Gold Line, consisting of dual trains on two separate parallel tracks running into and out of Los Angeles with departures in either direction would create a reliable system that would divert a significantly large number of commuters off the freeway. The Gold Line, also referred to as the L Line, exists, but only in Los Angeles County. San Bernardino County and SBCTA at one point were progressing toward extending the Gold Line from Pomona into Montclair, and that effort was infused with a \$41 million State of California Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program grant to cover the \$96 million cost. The long-term plan was to ultimately extend the Gold Line to Redlands, with stops at several spots in between, with the most significant being Ontario Airport. Nevertheless, the SBCTA board in 2019 abandoned the project, opting to return the \$41 million state grant in the process upon Dr. Wolfe concluding and advising the board the undertaking would prove too expensive.

“We need an alternative that meets the needs of the people,” Leon said. “As far as I am concerned, that solution was light rail. That should have been our priority, but the powers that be felt that pay lanes are the answer, because, I think, it is basically one of those issues that economically favors people with money. If you have money to pay to use the toll lanes, then you see a benefit from it. If you don’t have money, there is no benefit to you, even though finding the way to build it involved a tax that was equally spread over the people who will never use it because they are not prepared to pay a toll to use the freeway, although I am personally guilty of

using pay lanes when I need them.”

Leon said, “I believe there is a necessity to widen the freeway, but I would never have advocated pay lanes. My attitude is much different, and I would have been in favor of bringing light rail into the county and taking it as far east as we can. As it turned out, there was opposition to that and we could not achieve that, which is now a political fight we will meet at some other time.”

Leon said imposing tolls on commuters is the wrong way to go to increase the carrying capacity of the freeway.

“My question is: ‘Why?’” Leon said. “Why are we going to charge freeway drivers a toll, with the State of California full with abundance and a surplus to the point of \$18 billion? We’re charging an unfair 63 cents a gallon gas tax that was not voted upon and imposed by the government in order to address freeway congestion, bridge construction and grade separations and shoring up the infrastructure in California. I don’t know where that money – billions of dollars – is going. Then they want to charge us to use these *FasTrak* lanes, basically so that people with money can get to-and-fro quickly. I don’t find that fair. The opposition will say it is because we don’t have the money to build the improvements, but I thought that was what this gas tax is for.”

SBCTA’s haste and impatience in utilizing bond funding has contributed to the funding shortfall, resulting in tax money being diverted away from actual projects to debt service on past projects, Leon suggested. Those who are asserting that the toll lanes are justified are not doing so based upon logical analysis, Leon said, but to meet the preconceived expectations of SBCTA’s leadership that funding beyond what is available from the generous tax allotments already earmarked for transportation projects has to be generated, and freeway tolls are the easiest way to do that.

“You have to be a self-ordained expert not to see what is in front of you,”

Leon said. “We make the same mistake that most people do, which is to expect that our elected officials are somehow experts in everything, including finance.”

Past SANBAG board members and their current SBCTA counterparts listened to advisors such as bond counselors and bond attorneys who stood to obtain fees if the agency issued bonds as part of its financing approach, Leon said.

“They are making decisions based on what someone else tells them, and later you find out that may not have been the best thing to do,” he said.

Neither Hagman nor Wolfe nor Rutherford nor Michael nor Wapner nor Dutrey were willing to explain how they considered utilizing bond financing, essentially involving borrowing money so that the loans/bonds are secured with future tax revenue, can be justified.

Montclair City Manager Ed Starr took a stab at explaining what the rationale is for using bond financing to defray the cost of transportation infrastructure projects up front and forgoing simply banking an agency’s revenue stream, as in the case of SBCTA Measure I tax revenue, to instead have that agency pay as it goes by using that saved revenue to pay directly for improvement projects.

“By getting an infusion of funding up front you can do a range of projects over time that will be completed well ahead of the maturation of the bonds that were issued,” Starr said. “You can then move on to the next project. That allows you to do long range planning and do it at a more sophisticated level.”

If the cost of money – reflected in interest rates – is sufficiently low, Starr said, a public agency can get more bang for its buck by beginning its projects at the earliest possible date. That involves bond financing or borrowing against anticipated future revenues, he said.

“You settle on a group of projects and do them over a period of time,” Starr said. “After you complete those projects, the first bond is paid, at which point you can look

at refunding the project financing or doing another measure. That keeps you moving forward so that you are not just completing the one project you can afford to do but several projects that will benefit the public immediately as well as over time.”

He continued, “I understand why people object to creating long-term debt, but if you look at the lending market and interest rates available today, you are seeing an interest rate of 4 percent or lower,” he said. “When you look at it in that way, it makes more sense to do a large number of projects up front and benefit the community in a far deeper way than you would otherwise. If you have the cooperation of low interest rates in the lending market, that can be a more effective than paying as you go.”

Starr offered a defense of toll lanes as well.

“The argument against them, as I understand it, is they will not be used by low-income individuals so that they will, on one hand, be underutilized,” Starr said. “On the other hand, the argument against them is that if they are used to capacity, people will be paying to go no more quickly than if they were not using the lanes. People protest the existence of toll lanes because it is felt that they are a burden on lower income individuals who will not be able to use them. I believe that once you educate people that the toll lane is also a carpool lane if there are three or more people in their car, that addresses some of that basis for the objection. For people who need to get to their destination more quickly who are willing to pay the surcharge, this gives them an option, but, of course, they must be willing to pay.”

Starr said the system allows for people to register as *FasTrak* users ahead of time, but SBCTA is also going to incorporate a feature that will allow those who are not registered to use the system to travel in the toll lanes and make payment afterwards.

“Once they find out about that option, I think you will see people will make use of it,” Starr said.